TIEJE

The Expressed Critical Theory of European Prose Fiction before 1740 Exclusive of Problems of Characterization, setting, and Style

English

Ph. D.

1912

UNIV. OF
ILLINOIS
LIBRARY



THE UNIVERSITY

OF ILLINOIS

LIBRARY

1912
T44

The person charging this material is responsible for its return to the library from which it was withdrawn on or before the **Latest Date** stamped below.

Theft, mutilation, and underlining of books are reasons for disciplinary action and may result in dismissal from the University.

To renew call Telephone Center, 333-8400

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

BUILDING USE ONLY

L161—O-1096

THE EXPRESSED CRITICAL THEORY OF EUROPEAN PROSE FICTION BEFORE 1740 EXCLUSIVE OF PROBLEMS OF CHARACTERIZATION, SETTING, AND STYLE

BY

ARTHUR JERROLD TIEJE

A. M. Cornell University, 1904

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN ENGLISH

IN

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

1912

1917
T44

1912
T44

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

May 18, 1912

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY SUPERVISION BY

Mr. Arthur Jerrold Tieje

ENTITLED The Expressed Critical Theory of European Prose Fiction before 1740, exclusive of Problems of Characterization, Setting, & Style

BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF Doctor of Philosophy

In Charge of Major Work

R. M. Alden

Head of Department

Recommendation concurred in:

Committee on Final Examination

219667

UIUC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

CHAPTER I

The Critical Heritage of Fiction in 1579.....1

CHAPTER II

The Expressed Aims of Prose Fiction.....21

CHAPTER III

The Conscious Effort to Force Belief.....40

CHAPTER IV

The Theory of Romance.....56

CHAPTER V

The Theory of Romance-- Continued.....76

CHAPTER VI

The General Theories of the Remaining Types of Prose Fiction.....100

CHAPTER VII

The Problem of Unity.....118

CHAPTER VIII

Minor Problems of Technique.....128

APPENDIX A

Notes.....1

APPENDIX B

Bibliography.....CXX

PREFACE

Some nine years ago the germ of a fiction-loving sophomore at Harvard was caught by these words of a professor: "Very few people in England wrote fiction before Richardson; almost no one have thought much about theories of fiction before Scott." This sophomore, even then speculating upon the chance for a doctoral degree, stored away the words; and he remembers that, then, as an assistant at the University of Illinois, he had suggested to him the following subject for a dissertation: The Conscious Critical Theory of the Artist Novel from Sidney to Scott. The purpose of the study was to be the reprinting of such remarks upon prose fiction as were definitely devoted to that subject.

The topic was determined upon in 1916. Since then the sub-title sophomore has more than once altered a plan, that seemed, now too inclusive, now too exclusive. For instance, he soon discovered that before Richardson there existed nearly as much critical comment as between Richardson and Scott. Accordingly, he limited his researches to pre-Richardsonian fiction-- though with gratitude which he has gathered he hopes soon to publish a history of European fiction before Scott and Chateaubriand. On the other hand, the study of pre-Richardsonian criticism fell first to pieces, then to bits, and then back to pieces. In its final shape, the study has become a history of European critical comment upon fiction before Richardson. Herewith is presented as the author's doctoral dissertation part I of the study-- a unit covering all comment upon prose fiction not definitely limited to characterization, descriptive method, and style. Part II[1]

[1] The separate publication of part I was determined upon only late in the course of these researches; the author has in this merely followed the example of Koerting, von Klinger, and Hurst in Germany. Had time been, also, he had planned to correlate the two parts of his study since the second is complete in MS., by references from one to the other in notes. Unfortunately, the decision was made so late that the notes of part I still refer to ch. IX, X, XI, and XII. For these the reader will kindly substitute part II, ch. I, II, III, IV respectively.

covering these topics, will appear later.

Our words concerning the scope, purport, and arrangement of the study will be, it is hoped, self-explanatory. First of all, the author, like Lenora, has limited his study to the field of prose fiction. Partly this has been done because the field of critical comment upon poetic fiction is enormous. Mainly, however, the author has desired to maintain a manageable limits to his presentation of material gathered; and it is certainly true that he could not have done so, had he included research that very nearly entitled poetic fiction. On a number of points prose fiction undoubtedly possesses the same theory as poetic narrative; on a number of others, such as figurative language and tensile style, it early parted company from its relative. Accordingly, were the writer to quote Archi Bronze on writing the romance poetry, or to assume, because the Abbé d'Aubignac seems to think of his heroic poems as a kind of epic prose, that all the Abbé's remarks about poetry are also about prose, he would get nowhere. More important, perhaps, he would fail in revealing his principal influence.

For primarily this study is intended as a source-book for teachers of fiction and for those interested in the development of fiction. The author has consciously striven to neglect either in text or notes the significant passages of comment bearing of prose fiction and of prose fiction only--- Greek, Italian, Jewish, French, German, British. Nor is it a discussion of this theory that exists in this country upon our country, or that upon another; in each case the writer has naturally preferred the work of a specialist of any given point of view, recognizing corroborative matter to the fullest or even omitting it. Thus, since before 1670 Italy had begun modifying fictional theory, these countries receive their place in the earlier chapters of the dissertation. Since after 1667 France dominates in its turn, after that date France has won most attention. Germany, perhaps, may seem to have been ignored. This is because German fictional theory seems to be never to lose an individuality.

German fiction, however, has been carefully read. For this reading and consul-

sary to the author's secondary aim -- that of presenting a history of prose fiction before Richardson. The writer agrees that by the aid of the critical method in vogue at the time of writing he has succeeded in combining practice with theory that a fairly clear comprehension of the currents of fiction before Richardson is afforded. It is true that it was found impossible to construct a chronological view of the history of fiction ; but no effort has been made to arrange topics of theory that, if something is lost, something is also gained. The writer has begun with a general survey of anti practice and theory in fiction before 1579--a date very significant for England, succeeding after the fictional initiative of Italy and Spain has been exhausted, and one preceding the period of marked French influence. This discussion is to be followed with a treatment of the aims expressed by fictionists, a study of the struggle between imagination and purported fact, an analysis of the general theories of such types of fiction as writers themselves recognized, and, finally, a treatment of the problem of structural technique. As has been said, studies upon characterization, the use of background, and the matter of style will follow. The author can not but think that this material is a history of fiction.

Only a few words remain to be added. The method of the bibliography in Appendix A is there explained. As for notes, since they have in general been illustrative, they have been relegated to Appendix A -- perhaps the most valuable portion of the entire work. References are in general given in full, even in the case of six words. To these reference is made by the author's name; the list comprises Koerting's Geschichte des französischen Romans im 17ten Jahrhundert, Lode's Der griechische Roman, von Wilpert's Der deutschen Roman in Frankreich, Reynier's Le roman sentimental avant L'Astrée, Warren's Note before the 18th Century, and Miss Morgan's Novel of Manners.

Acknowledgement for valuable aid the author owes to the first five of those works, mainly, however, in regard to valuable discussion of the practice of fiction; Miss Morgan's pioneer investigation reached him too late to be of real actual use. Personal grateful acknowledgements the writer tenders, first and foremost, to Professor C.

M. Greenough of Harvard, who had once read this in hours of weariness and despair; and after him, to Professor L. M. Eddy and Mr. [illegible] of the University of Illinois. It is a pleasure, also, to offer thanks to Mr. Clarence S. Jones, to Professor [illegible] B. Fitzgerald, and to Mr. L. [illegible] V. Jones, all of the University of Illinois. Nor would it be fitting to pass by the courtesy of various librarians, American and foreign, particularly those [illegible] of the University of Illinois, of Harvard, and of the Bibliothèque Nationale.

[illegible] OF THE CRITICAL [illegible] OF FICTION [illegible] 1579

To many students of literature it will undoubtedly seem strange that after the researches into Renaissance criticism of Saintsbury, Gregory-Smith, Spingarn, and others, there should be left any material to garner. Certainly there is none of importance save in the field of prose fiction. Here, however, even though before 1626 no treatises seem to have been devoted to the subject, there exists a certain amount of material. Sometimes it is embedded in a preface or dedication; sometimes it is buried in the midst of a narrative. In any event, this material deals with "purpose"--a term henceforth to be used as indicating the reason or reasons stated by an author for his composition; with an aspect of realism which consists in an effort to make a reader believe a story which is told to him; with unity and coherence of structure; with style; and, finally, with some scattering problems best relegated to notes.

Before examining authors' theories, however, it will be valuable briefly to define the types of prose fiction which can be distinguished before 1579-- the date which may be said to close the Renaissance period of fiction. Four main lines of influence reached the last quarter of the sixteenth century; five others of some importance can be detected.

Oldest of the leading four influences was the Greek novel, which, if Lucian's True History is disregarded, may be confined to two forms, a love-and-adventure type of story, illustrated in the work of Iamblichus, Xenophon of Ephesus, Heliodorus, Tatius, Chariton, and Eustathius, and a love-and-pastoral type, exemplified only in in that of Longus. The first form may be defined as an imitation of the Greek epic, save that it is much shorter, treats much more of love than of arms, and is not only more unified but also more chary of ornament and of episode. The second form differs from the first in that, though it also deals primarily with love, it embodies much less adventure, and possesses a pastoral aim, which allows of infinite digression and of marked descriptive and poetic embellishment.

The second of the four chief influences lay in the mediaeval prose romances,

which clearly divide with the Greek novel and with the Spanish pastoral the honor of having inspired the Arcadia of Sidney and the Astrée of d'Urfé. The prose Merlin, itself already differing from the metrical romances, is typical of the earlier prose romances; later and much more artistic examples are the great Amadis de Gaul, the Palmerin of England,[3] and Tirante the White. All these differ conspicuously from the Greek novel. They are almost entirely lacking in unity; they are martial rather than amorous; they introduce enchantments to an extent undreamed--of by Heliodorus or Tatius; they are limited to a stereotyped round of characters-- King, Queen, Knight, lady, hermit, enchanter, fairy, squire, damsel, giant, dwarf, savage man; they are stored with set speeches, laments, orations, soliloquies, conversations.[4] Still, within the class thus defined, divergences are visible. Southey's comment on the "indecency not obscenity" of the Palmerin de Oliva[5] is almost equally applicable to the Amadis, whereas Palmerin of England has only a few "kind" ladies, and but one startlingly rakish hero, Gloriana of the Desert. Again, though Palmerin revels in the supernatural, Tirante the White long afterward aroused the praise of the Comte de Tressan for admitting only "probable impossibilities"-- a bit of praise rather overdone, perhaps.

The third influence-- the prose pastoral-- had begun to work even before Amyot's paraphrase of Longus's Daphnis and Chloe (1559).[6] By 1542 Italy had produced two important pastorals-- Boccaccio's Ameto (1343) and Sannazaro's Arcadia (1504), and Spain one-- Montemayor's Diana (1542); the Arcadia was in French by 1544 and the Diana by 1578. The prose pastoral of Italy and Spain is hard to define.[7] Like the mediaeval romance,[8] it is ununified-- though in the Arcadia and the Ameto the plot is simplicity itself.[9] Like the Greek novel, it has a love motif far more sentimental and chaste than that of most mediaeval romances. But unlike the lovers of either the Greek novel or the mediaeval romance, those of the prose pastoral are "courtly" shepherds and shepherdesses, prone to indulge in dissertation and song. And again, unlike the bare scenery of the Greek novel and the yet barer background of the mediaeval romance, the setting of the prose pastoral is invariably described with lavish and not unskilled hand.

The fourth influence --the novella-- also came from Italy. In its birth-place,

in the hands of Boccaccio and Bandello, as well as of most other novellieri, its brisk outline, offering material not for a modern short-story, nor for a modern novel, was characterized by brevity, by emphasis upon incident, by close-knit sequence, and by freedom from description and characterization. In general, the characters were lay-figures. But in France, in the Histoires Tragiques of Boiteau and Belleforest (1559), the shape of the novella grew plethoric with horrid and immoral "studyings", and in England, in Painter's Palace of Pleasure and Fenton's Tragicall Historias (1567), it became "of monstrous size" because of lascivious descriptions and virtuous "addresses to the reader." The characters remained lay figures; the background was stressed.

Thus much for the great influential types. Five minor forms in fiction have been mentioned, and remain to be considered-- though summarily. One was the voyage imaginaire, consisting in an unrelated series of adventures, determined by a "purpose" either satirical, as in Lucian's True History, diverting, as in Mandeville's Travels, or reformatory, as in More's Utopia. Another was the fable-collection, sometimes a volume of unconnected tales, as in Aesop's Fables or the Gesta Romanorum, sometimes a sequence of stories placed within a frame-work narrative, as in Kalilah and Dimnah or the Three Princes of Serendip (Italian, 1557; Fr., 1610). Yet another was the Letters of Abelard and Heloise, which, although not fictitious, was very early published with suppression of such matter as was not germane to the narrative. Still a fourth was the picaresque tale, which had appeared in Petit Jehan de Saintré (1459; Eng. 1618), in the renditions of the golden ass by Apuleius (1512) and by Adlington (1566), and, above all, in the vivacious series of character-sketches of the immortal Lazarillo de Tormes (1554). Finally, a fifth was that may be called the "psychological" novel-- its chief representatives being the Aucassin and Nicollete, the Fiammetta of Boccaccio, the Celestina (1499), and the Amadis and Palmerin (1491).

Surely it would be remarkable, were all these varieties of fiction to have existed without giving rise to some speculation upon at least the "purpose" of fiction-- "purpose," it may be remembered, being the term which has been used to express the first of the four great topics upon which early fictionists commented. "Purpose," indeed, received the greatest share of their remarks-- and they seem to have distinguished five reasons for composition. Amusement, edification, and instruction of the reader--

these three aims are very often proclaimed. The aim to represent life as it is in its daily happenings is here and there announced. Latest of all, the five expressed "purposes" is that of arousing the sympathetic emotion of the reader.

The amusement of the reader seems to have been the earliest expressed aim of fiction. At least, almost the only passage on the aim of the Greek novel is one in Theagenes and Charicles, which may be said to have seized upon the value of the principle of contrast as attracting the interest of a reader; it runs thus (p.187): "But then the fortune which governed their affairs, when it had refreshed them a few hours, and given them leave to be merry one day, suddenly joined thereto heavy and terrible things." [17] Yet it may be said that this is not conscious theory. Certainly such objection can not be advanced against the statements of two other sources of "amusement"-- the appeal of mere variety of subject-matter and the bait of tales of the impossible. "Variety" is one of the most frequent bargain-cries of the pastoral romance, the picaresque tale, and the novella of France or England. "Leucippe and Clitophon," writes Angell Daye of his translation, "excellently describing the weight of affection, the simplicity of love, the purport of honest meaning, the resolution of men, and disposition of fate, finished in a pastoral, and interlaced with the praises of a most peerless princess." [18] "What one does not eat, another will," is Hurtado's summons to the banquet spread by Lazarillo, "hence no circumstance ought to be omitted, how insignificant soever it may be." In his sixth dedication Belleforet submits many wares to his patron, "because I know the high-bred delicacy of your wit is desirous of variety." "Variety" may be made to cover the impossible; it does not necessarily do so. Lucian, however, decides that amusement need have no concern with fact. The True History is intended to "not only yield a bare content by the pleasing and comely composure;" it is also to contain "many notorious lies persuasively delivered." [19]

In general, one may assume that any declaration of the "aim of amusement" was honest. The acceptance of a far more obtrusive "purpose" --edification-- is another matter. Spingarn has pointed out that during the Renaissance "imaginative literature" was justified by due analysis of its allegorical, ethical, and civilizing functions. On all of these functions the fictionists had something to say; but, as one soon sees,

such broad defenses were not sufficient for writers who were that, with no Homer or Virgil behind them, they must "creep" rather than "intrude" or "come" into the literary "fold." Accordingly, the student of their views is but following them in discarding the classification of Spingarn and in speaking of their social, religious, and moral aims. The last of these purposes will lead him directly to the battle-ground of "art for art's sake."

The expression of social, religious, and general moral aims in fiction need not be dwelt upon. More's Utopia best voices the social aim, the anonymous Robert the Devil (152?) the specifically religious, and Underdowne's version of the Theagenes and Chariclea (1569) the moral; Adlington's preface to his translation of the Golden Ass (1566) may represent the extravagancies of the "moral" claim.[20] Giles in the preface to the Utopia writes to Buslyde of Rythloday's "singular prudence, who so well and wittily marked and bare away all the original causes and fountains.... whereof both issueth and springeth the mortal confusion and utter decay of a commonwealth, and also the advancement and wealthy state of the same may rise and grow."[21] "How willingly, see," rejoices the narrator of Robert the Devil, "he hath forsaken for the salvation of his soul all his friends and his country and land, and all his delicate meats and drinks, and gay raiments, and worldly pleasures."[22] "This book," bursts out Underdowne before the Theagenes, "punisheth the faults of evil-doers and rewardeth the well-livers. What a king is Hydaspes! What a pattern of a good prince? Contrarywise, what a lewd woman was Arsace? What an evil end had she?" But one may be inclined to comment that Arsace's lewdness is more vividly drawn than her "evil end?" Then let one give ear to Adlington on the gay tale of the Golden Ass! "The effect thereof tendeth to a good and virtuous moral.... in this feigned jest.... is comprehended a figure of a man's life.... whenas we suffer our minds to be drowned in the sensual lusts of the flesh."[23]

Was Adlington sincere? It really is of no importance. But when we turn to the novellieri, Italian, French, and English, the belief of authors that they must declare an aim, at least not immoral, becomes significant. For it is with Boccaccio that there begins for prose fiction a battle raging even to-day-- that which has been styled the struggle of art for art's sake. How far the theory of Boccaccio is

covert attack upon morality in fiction, how far the modern must make allowance for the customs of a more lenient generation, are questions not essential to the present discussion. The point is that in the Decameron are embodied nearly all types of defense of the "questionable" in fiction, and that attack and counter in regard to each type had much to do with the content and structure of seventeenth and early eighteenth fiction.

That the Decameron aroused a tempest of indignation is clear, nor does either its popularity or the fact that the church's condemnation was withdrawn when cavaliers and princes were substituted for monks and abbots as dramatis personae prove anything to the contrary. But to determine fully Boccaccio's own position there should be considered not only the announcement in the proemio of a two-fold aim of amusement and edification, but also the reception of the stories by the ladies of the party, the expert balancing within the stories of the claims of art, truth, and morality, and, above all, the epilogue to the Decameron. The double aim expressed in the proemio offers little help in determining Boccaccio's attitude toward morality in fiction.[24] The equilibrium preserved within the tales can scarcely be called "conscious" theory.[25] But the reception of the novelle by the ladies[26] reveals, if nothing more, a curious levity, not entirely balanced by certain well-calculated sops to the moral Cerberus--the apology for license in the proemio; the privilege of choice of material allowed by the suffrage of the company to Dioneo;the stipulation for Days I and IX that "this .... day.... each be free to discuss that matter which most pleases him;" the anger of Fiammetta over Dioneo's proposed songs at the close of Day V; the objections of the ladies to the unseemly subjects forced upon them by Dioneo, King of Day VII; the praise of chastity by Emilia (Day I, novella 7); the emphasis by Dioneo upon the decorous conduct of the "brigade," even at a time when the pestilence permitted any kind of impropriety.[27] As for the epilogue, it merits close analysis both for its own sake and because it closely resembles some passages in the Canterbury Tales.

The epilogue is certainly adroit in its defense of the tales of the Decameron. Boccaccio first denies outright that he has used "too much license" in the "stuff" of the novelle. Yet, if he has, he adds, he has employed"decent words," or, if some words are not decent, he "has not been able to relate" the stories otherwise. Then,

too, he goes on, hypocritical ladies speak daily of "fare di cavalli e cavalle e castelle (cf. Day VIII, novel 2) e salsiccia e mortadello." Further, he continues, the place of relation is not in a church or school, but in "a place of solace, among persons, young, indeed, yet mature enough not to be easily seducible by tales, in a time in which andar con le tracche in stanza per isquazzare di se" was not unseemly in the most straitlaced. Still further, just as wine (which "for the healthy is most good," according to two-- noted Arumaeres), fire, and weapons are dangerous if wrongly employed, so are his words. In them the corrupt will read corruption, but by them the estimable will be altered no more than the "brightness" of the sky by "earthly filth." For that matter, the corrupt draw evil from Scripture. Yet more, "he has not been able to nor could he write save that which was related," and he "would have written the beautiful," had the beautiful been told. After all, he concludes, in "novellizing to unlearned maidens," "it would have been folly to go searching and fatiguing" himself "in finding delicate (exquisite) terms, and to take much care to speak moderately;" are there not "warning" headings to the tales? .... As has been said, any one is free to infer what he pleases from Boccaccio's defense. I am frank to confess that I think that here is the eye cocked at morality. That the leer is half-concealed is a tribute to the need to "justify" fiction.

If Boccaccio is not a hardened inhabitant of the Platonic Republic, neither is Sandello. Sandello does not make Boccaccio's parade. Yet he has some pleasing moral aims. "The which," he professes at. III of his Novelle (1554), "was certes to none other end than to divert and to warn all sorts and conditions of men to leave unseemthings and to live honestly." [25] Other novellieri, such as Ser Giovanni (1378) and Straparola (1550) tell their stories without such comment one way or the other.

In few cases does the moral zeal of Boccaccio or Sandello affect the structure of their novelle; rarely is Boccacio found more than outlining a lascivious situation, and scholastic "sermons in little" creep into his narratives. [27] In France and in England the "case is altered," Belleforet, whose love for "variety" has been commented upon, impartially dropped into his translations of Sandello now huge "sentences", now titbits of indelicacy. "Moral purpose" is a mantle made to cover both. "Thus example," he pompously proclaims in the epistre to Vol. III, "has such power that it seems to

carry painted upon its forehead an image of righteousness." He follows this with the admirable sentiment: "I speak here of love, entirely as under a good surgeon of some putrefaction or abscess." In England Painter, Fenton, and others yearn to outstrip Belleforet in both theory and practice. Fenton, e.g., adds to the single tale of Cardenio and Claudina five aesthetically lascivious scenes-- pointed out with admiration by a recent editor. Yet Fenton writes before the Tragicall Histories (1567): "Wickedness may be used without any intent to persuade any imitation that way, but rather to provoke the multitude by familiar trains to avoid such conditions as they saw justly reprehended in others." It is of moment for technique, too, that before each of thirteen tales Fenton has a long moral argument, which had been barely suggested in Bandello and which was at least much shorter in Belleforet; that within the stories numerous paragraphs of moralizing "oblectate" the reader; and that each narrative has a pious 10-20 line conclusion. Painter is still more meticulous than Fenton. "Old and young," invites the preface to "Day I of the Palace of Pleasure (1566), "may learn how to avoid the ruin, overthrow, inconvenience, and displeasure ..... of them (Boccaccio's Novelle) have I redeemed to the liberty of our vulgar such as may be best liked and better suffered."[30]

Amusement and edification, as has already been stated, do not exhaust the list of the expressed aims of pre-Sidneyan fiction. The desire to impart instruction seems to beat in the breasts of fictionists; indeed, witness the numerous manuals of courtliness, such as Nimaud's selections from the Amadis (v. note 4). It is not, of course, that fiction composed of nothing but miscellaneous information was produced-- merely that in certain types of fiction "manners" were held up for imitation, and that in others little learned dissertations were more or less skillfully inlaid in the text. Important spokesmen for the first aim are Boccaccio and Caxton, for the second Fenton. For instance, though on the first day of the Decameron each narrator is to tell what he pleases, both that Day and Day VI are devoted to the recounting of apt repartee. The reason, as again and again given, is most clearly phrased before the seventh novella of Day I: "It is, as it were, wonderful, when any unexpected thing suddenly appears, if suddenly of an archer it be struck."[31] Again, in the prologue to Caxton's Aeneydos we read: "In which may all valiant princes and other nobles see

many valorous feats of arms, and also this present book is necessary to all citizens and inhabitants in towns and castles, for they shall see, how sometime they the great and many other places, strong and inexpugnable, have been besieged, assayed and assailed." Fenton's quote is this: "There is required in all estates, both a faith and a fear to God, and also an outward policy in worldly things: the one is to be learned by perusing the Scripture, and the other can not be gotten but by the assistance of histories." [32] Quite apart, however, from such "civilizing" ideals as these, instruction in narrative technique had appeared as an aim of satire other than that of Lucian in the inimitable Sir Thopas. In the use of wind-sucked worms and island-sailing giants in his True History, Lucian is specifically assailing the "many monstrous and intolerable untruths" of Ctesias, Iambulus, and Homer.[33] He is thus the ancestor of William Dean Howells, not to mention Cervantes, Lorca, and Voltaire.

The fourth aim of prose fiction --the depiction of life-- was clearly announced before 1579 only by Bandello. It is true that a conception of realism of which Spingarn (p.87) finds "scarcely any traces.... in anything like its modern sense" is evident in the picture which Boccaccio presents in the Decameron of plague-stricken Florence, and, more "accidentally," in the opening of the Fiammetta. Still, Boccaccio's definite remarks are few and related more to method of narration than to "purpose." His novelle are to be of matters 'occurrent in modern times' as well as in ancient; the names of his ten characters are intentionally disguised; and there are occasional references to the interests of contemporaries.[34] It remained, then, for Bandello to vie with the modern reporter. Before novella after novella one reads such passages as this, from the dedication to the fifty-first of t. I: "Marvellous, indeed, are the chances which befall out of the ordinary course of our daily way of life, and oftentimes, whereas we read them, they move us to wonderment.... Wherefore ..... I have chosen to send it to you (standing fully sure) she went to speak with the King in question ere she died." Not Greene, not Lyly, not Lodge has a clearer statement of realistic aim. Doubtless Bandello is no realist in the modern sense. That the realistic claim is fully voiced is important.

But one "purpose" of prose fiction remains for discussion-- the effort to arouse emotion in the reader.[35] Boccaccio and his imitators must, as far as I know,

here receive all the credit for expression. Apparently, however, two phases of the life are not clearly distinguished: the one the mere awaking of emotion, the other the ultimate value of this awakened emotion in expelling "disagreeable" emotions from the reader. In the latter case one is at once reminded of the Aristotelian catharsis. The vague air is best noted in the opening of the Decameron: "And since there are, who, hit by the bitter sun of Cytherea, some for consolation and some for delight searching the ancient loves, at one time with desiring heart carry off Helen, at another resistless Dido, at another lament with Calphile, and at another beguile with anxious care Medea." Nearer to a theory of catharsis is the beginning of the Fiammetta: "There is woe within the miserable dealt to grow from grief, when they discern or feel compassion in some one for them. Therefore, in order that in me, more eager to grieve than to do ought else, because through long use the cause thereof does not lessen but increases, it pleases me, noble ladies, in whose hearts love dwells, perchance more happily than in mine, narrating to you my fortunes, to make you, if I can, pitying." Purgation proper is suggested in the proem to the Decameron: "A humane thing it is to have compassion on the afflicted.... because from my first youth even to this time I have been beyond measure inflamed of noble and most high love.....more pain than was needful to me many times I made myself feel//.. in which pain so much alleviated the pleasing speeches of some friend and his laudable consolations afforded me, that I regard it as most certain that through these it has arrived that I am not dead.... and.... in order not to seem ingrate, I have determined within myself, in that small way which I can.... to those who have need of it to offer some consolation."

In quoting the views of Boccaccio and Sidney in regard to depicting of life as a fictional aim, it has been difficult to keep from encroaching upon the second great field in which the fictionists before 1670 did some theorizing. This field was, as has already been said, that aspect of realism which consists in trying to make a reader believe a story. The attempt is of importance because, like "purpose," it affected the content and structure of fiction-- particularly after 1670. Before that date, however, the effort exhibited three phases. The use of appeals to authority for one's substance is wide-spread; the development of prefaces which are prac-

tically first chapters begins; and in Italy, at least, the relation of truth to delight and of truth to artistic duty is bandied upon.

The appeal to authority is apparently as old as fiction. [illegible] in a "point to" and unverified lore afterward is the source of the "book of the Knight Errant Rule."[36] In medieval romance references to "chronicles" are omnipresent. Geoffrey of Monmouth had a certain "old book." "In the story aforesaith," "so saith the book," or, as a variant, "these words in the book" occurs in the great Merlin at least seventy-six times. "It is written," gravely reasons the author of Amadis of England, "in the ancient chronicles of [illegible], from which this history hath been taken."[37] Is it strange that Rabelais assures us (Vol.i, p.197): "It will not be an ill thing to put you in mind of the fountain.... whence is derived unto us the good Antopruel; for I see that all good historiographers have thus handled their chronicles." But the dream novel and the romance were not alone in these claims of veracity. The novella in Italy insisted, especially under Bandello, upon its truth; and Belleforet, together with the English paraphrasers, refers to "authority" in more than one case when his own assumption of a grievous bit of obscenity would have harmonized ill with his moral pleonexy. One of Belleforet's exercises will suffice (Histoires Tragiques, Vol. IV, epistre): "I adue them with the name of historles, as having collected them from good authors, and such as are not suspected of lying, so that you who desire the truth, may see that history should be severely treated, as being the mirror of our life."

Though in the voyage imaginaire the appeal to historical authority is not so common as in the romance, it is with the former type of fiction that the preface developed furthest. In this place the Utopia can not be exploited in all that extra-narrative cleverness so unhappily omitted from some recent editions; but obviously all the cleverness is rooted in the wish to make readers believe that Utopia existed and that its communal prosperity was practicable.[38] If More's many hits in the preface, the most significant, in the light of a similar but later movement, are the prefatory letter from Giles to Busleyde; the twice-expressed anxiety to recall every detail; the debate concerning the bridge of Amaurote; the quibbling over the rights of publication; the prevention of any answer to the query, "Where is Utopia?" through the

interruption of the questioner, once by the entrance of a servant, and once by a fit of coughing; the emphasis on the uprightness both of Lytliology and more; the translation of some Utopian verse; and, finally, the subjoining to the book of a Utopian alphabet. Already the preface is on the way to becoming a first chapter.

The appeal of authors to authority and their ideas of a "preface" are distinctly worth examination; more far-reaching is Boccaccio's connection of truth with delight in the reader, and Pandello's relation of truth to artistic "duty." In the Decameron Fiammetta says (Day V, novella 9): "a novella which, had I wished or did I wish to depart from the truth of the matter, I should well have known and do know how to compose and write under other names; but because departure from the truth in novel-telling is a great diminution of delight in the hearer, in its own form.... I shall tell it." Pandello writes in the dedication to the fifty-first novella of his Pt. I of the "sanctity of history (i.e. reportorial reports of the day), which ought to be written with truth." Over and over again, too, he makes such declarations as that in the dedication to Pt. I: "The matter seeming to me worth compassion and record, precisely as it had been related by the Alemanni, so I wrote it." In recent years we have listened to similar utterances-- truer, perhaps.

It must now be fairly clear that even before 1579 the technique of fictional structure in its narrowest sense was more or less dependent upon the author's expressed aim in composition and upon his relation to the prevalent desire to be believed. However, the period's actual opinion of what we now call unity and coherence of plot becomes much more plain, if some other matters are considered. Such matters are the the usage of fictionists in making transitions from one group of characters to another; the existence of a quest for brevity in narration; the recognition of certain broad types of digression; and the statement of a law for the opening of picaresque tales. It may be objected that these topics are all considerations of unconscious practice rather than conscious theory. I can only answer that the material which follows is so closely related to conscious theory that I feel bound to include it, and that, moreover, it is most important for an understanding of the narrative structure adopted by Sidney, Cervantes, d'Urfé, and Lesen.

Every one is familiar with the chief transitional ploy of the medieval romancers-- the "let-us-now-to-return-to" formula. At once the query arises: if this formula is consciously used by an author, what is its significance for constructive technique? Ardis Butler, who considered this feature an indicating property in the art of narration,[4] without going so far as to assume with Merwin that Merlin is in error and that the early romancers were utterly unscrupulous in regard to unity, it is difficult to see how such transitions as the following imply anything save the triviality of a stereotyped device: "But of all these matters we shall speak at this time till that the matter ask thereto hereafter" (Merlin, 397); "but let us speak of the two queens that is in the castle of Tresse"(Merlin, 734); "Here the history leaves him and returns to Clarendos"(Chronicle of England, Vol. III, p.116). And what of the yet more damning fact that the transitional phrase is often useless? E.g., in the case of the second Merlin quotation, a skirmish of scene from the battle-field near Tresse to the town itself not only does not occur until nine lines beyond the phrase quoted, but is then more satisfactorily managed by the motion of the cloud of arrow carrying from the field to the besieged city. Is Merwin then right? Not entirely, as has been hinted. For, despite the practical certainty that from the romancer's point of view the "let-us-return" formula has no relation to an effort at coherence, the very use of the formula seems to bring to the reader's notice the characteristic lack of unity in the mediaeval romances. The result had to be (and was) either the production by an author of more unified work, or the development of less obtrusive transitions. Either step (v. ch. VII) may be called an advance in "narrative art."

Let us recall that the technical "let-us-return" formula, and of varying importance for a movement toward unity, were several other types of transitional phrase. Two of these, the address to the reader and the long forecast or summary were of moment in that, by the aid of memory, they guided the reader through a maze; perhaps, also, like the "let-us-return", they may have called the attention of readers slowly becoming critical to the fact that there was a maze. As for other kinds of transitional device, these seem to me totally unconnected with any struggle toward unity;

[illegible] that I feel yet to be clarified, and [illegible] to [illegible] will. [illegible] from the average [illegible] to the reader,- the "as have heard spoke afore" or "as I have said"-- is the insertion between the prose and verse portions of [illegible] or [illegible] [illegible] at [illegible][42]. [illegible] is relatively, in, ordinary speech, rather rare; I have noted it in Palestra and Euphues (p. 77;87), and almost nowhere else. The use of a person coming from walls overlooking battle-field or bar-counter is well exemplified in Planchedyne and Lucantine (p. 125): "In [illegible] [illegible] at this time was leaning upon her window sur..." In the same romance the [illegible] of a canon is employed seven times for transition; e.g., one reads (p.121): "Ten sails and his navy held their way toward Cassidonia." The use of contrast, in such expressions as "on the other side," "but," etc., is not infrequent; almost in the guise of figure is found of "but" or even of the more emphatic of a name. These, again, occasionally, after the example of some in the Iliad, sprinkle for vigor. Finally, reference to the passing of time is found everywhere as a means of transition; I am confident that no one approaches Lyly in range, closer and closer second to Sir-narrative." A typical illustration of this device is a passage from Planchedyne and Lucantine (p.117): "At the same hour that Darius took shipping.... the provost of [illegible] and many other barons of [illegible][43] the seas."

As with the formulas of transition, so with the phrases announcing desire for brevity in narration; their connection with the effect of unity must be judged more from an impartial presentation of practice than from any generalization by some modern critic [illegible] of minute tabulation. Even, however, the investigation preliminary to such a presentation has revealed [illegible] advanced; three facts confront the searcher. The first is that in the more significant forms of early prose fiction remarks upon brevity are exceedingly common, the second that the origin of such remarks is ascribed to be objection to repetition, to [illegible], and to prolixity; the third [illegible] the use of these remarks seems at first to be limited to the conversational portions of a narrative, and thence to have passed to the more direct parts of the narration. Sometimes one passage exemplifies all these facts.

Types of transition-formulas are of some importance; the various phrases indi-

omitting curtailments are not. It does not matter whether an author writes "to be short," "in brief," "let this suffice," "what helpeth longer tale," or some words more individual; it is the kind of material which is omitted and the causes stated for the omission which affect technique. Information already known, of course, is the most obvious matter to expunge; consequently, here and there summaries are cut short. But the whole theory of avoiding undue repetition is very neatly put by Boccaccio; many a writer must have thought similarly. "A tale," Boccaccio makes Filomena say in the Decameron (Day VI, novella I), "which indeed of itself deserved attention, because it was a known and commendable history, but yet delivered so haltingly with idle repetitions of some particulars three or four several times, mistaking one thing for another (and wandering erroneously from the essential subject, seeming near an end and then beginning again)." [44] Another kind of material omitted is that the details of which would cause great difficulty in the enumeration; the themes most likely to be curtailed on this account --though the reason is least often stated-- [45] are lists of eatables, pleasures, speeches, names, equipments. "And," says the author of the Merlin (p.375): "it needeth not to speak of the meats ne the services that they had that day, for it were but loss of time." "Whereto," he queries elsewhere, (412), "should I tarry to rehearse their service and the ease of soft beds?" "Why," he asks again (454), "devise the joy and the delights that they had?" "Of their words," we are told (84), "this was the sum." Doubtless, these particular shortenings are trivial; [46] furthermore, it is true that a much more unified romance than the Merlin, the Vulgate of Lancelot, contains (Vol. I, pp. 155-156) an unsurpassed catalogue of knights and (I, 158-161) a yet more appalling chronicle of armorial accoutrement. [47] Still, with at least one other group of material we are on significant ground. No one versed in the love-monologues of Lyly, Cervantes, and d'Urfé can fail to wish that a remark of Whetstone in Promos and Cassandra had become an eleventh commandment for fiction-writers. "I will now overleap," he declares, (p.53), "what a number of sour and sweet thoughts feed these distempered lovers."

But more important than the kinds of material thus early excinded are, as has been observed, the expressed reasons for excision. Two causes have been commented

upon-- the seldom-disclosed physical impossibility of enumeration of detail, and the often-enunciated wish to avoid repetition. The other two assigned reasons -- "to eschew prolixity" and to shun "tediousness"-- are more influential.[47] Without doubt these phrases, too, may be meaningless. "To eschew prolixity" is but a prelude to much detail in Reynes, Knight of the Swan, p. 72 ; and "Look, master host, with how long and tedious tale I have kept you" (Sto ia, p. 34) is but polite verbiage. On the other hand, he who relizes in Palmerin of England (Vol. II, p. 256) that, "to avoid prolixity," he is to be spared a second roll-call of knights, will gladly grant significance to the passage; and the following sentence from Lazarillo de Tormes is at least suggestive: "But to avoid being dull, I will leave out many things both curious and remarkable." With a comment from Bandello the student finds himself on the border-land between ordinary desire for brevity and the recognition of digression-- our next topic. Bandello writes (p. I, Novella 26): "If I should begin to tell those things which I saw in the time that I sailed along the Levant seas, very tedious it would be for you to hear...."[57]

Digression is a treacherous word; particularly elusive is the question of whether the employment of the thing for which the word stands was or was not conscious before 1579. This much is clear; that even now there are writers who firmly refuse to regard certain kinds of digression as literary sins in fiction, and that even before Sidney there were apologies for digressive peccadilloes.[37] To reconcile these two attitudes, it seems to me that one must remember all that we have said upon expressed aims in fiction, and that, further, one may distinguish six classes of digression-- narrative, descriptive, edifying, informational, critical, and personal. The fact seems to be that the "digressions" of one type of fiction, with one kind of aim, may be the "ornaments" of another species of fiction, with a different aim.

At once, accordingly, there may be swept aside such a broad statement as that of Furnivall, when he decides (Introduction to Merlin, p. CCXLIV) that, because additions to mediaeval romances were "incongruous," "the artistic sense in most of the mediaeval story-tellers was sadly awry." The incongruousness no one will dispute; the judgment upon the narrators is a non-sequitur. If one writes a fictional sermon, why should one not stop to moralize? If one aims at variety of offering, why should

one not include in one's novel verses, model letters, [illegible]? If one yearns to instruct, why should one not throw the preponderance of material to Utopian rules of life or Lylian conversations? In fine, the entire problem of digression for the pre-Sidneyan period of fiction, at least, is that of the attitude of the authors of a single type of fiction to that type; and, consequently, the safest mode of determining that attitude is to seek for expressions of opinion in regard to each type. Fortunately, since the Greek novel, the chivalric and pastoral romances, and the novella were alone produced in large numbers, the quest may be confined to those types.

Nowhere in the Greek novel, save in the Theagenes, [42] is digression admitted. Wandering from the subject of a narrative is common. E/g., in the Daphnis and Chloe are five lengthy narrative-insertions, varying from a war to fables included at random; in the Clitophon and Leucippe are five irrelevant tales, an account of Tyrian dye (p.378), descriptions of animals (420-423), details of pictures (404-406), and a debate on the pleasures of Alcibiadean love; in Anthia and Abrocomas are two tales; and in the True History are satirical diatribes and lumps of curious information. Yet for none of these is there apology. The case of the Theagenes, as has been indicated, is different. Digressions, some nineteen in number, occur; and these divagations consist, not only of intercalated narrative, but of moral exhortations, odd fragments of knowledge, and descriptions. But against these nineteen digressions are nine apologies in the long tale of Calasiris (pp.61-123; 136-152), and one in Heliodorus's direct narrative. Are not two things suggested-- the influence of the spoken tale upon the written, and the debt of Sidney to the technique of the Theagenes? [43]

Fewer than in this one Greek novel are the number of passages touching upon the recognition of digression, which I have gleaned from five chivalric and four pastoral romances. Of the 300 or more pages of the prose Merlin 30 are sheer divagation, mainly narrative or moral-allegorical; the Branchardyn and Lybeaus contains, besides much extraneous narrative, a queer social lesson (p.173) upon the impossibility of churls being gentlemen; the Arcadia is full of odd facts about omens and portents; the Di-

and rejoices in a learned Shepherd who discourses of the origin of [illegible] (113-b) and in other country-folk who debate the supremacy of love and reason (164), etc. Yet comments of even the slightest significance in regard to digression are made only once in the Merlin (p.503): "but now repaireth the tale to his matter that he hath left for to tell this thing;" only once in the Palmerin of England (Vol.I, p. 318): "I will not fill the paper with the deeds of others, and so leave unwritten those of him from who: the book taketh its name;" and only once in all three parts of the Diana (p. 344).

But if the Greek novel and the chivalric and pastoral romances offer little help in the study of the fictionists' view of digression, the Italian novelle and their migrations do. In their tales Boccaccio and Bandello take note of their rare and short ~~##~~ excursuses afield. Says the former (Decameron, Vol. I, p.69): "but returning to that which I had commenced;" remarks the latter (Pt I, novella 22): "Now I, not watching myself, have erred in making panegyrics instead of telling stories."[54] On the contrary Belleforest, Painter, Fenton, and Whetstone are all for license of inclusion; in the most care-free and unapologetic fashion they indulge in moral, informational, and personal ramblings. The English paraphrasers offend most; both Painter and Fenton precede Lyly and Greene in defending and attacking 'ladies',[55] while Fenton will go out of his way to assail the Papists (Tragicall Histories, Vol. I, p.232). Occasionally one does meet in the English fictionists the phrase, "short digression;" and once Fenton exclaims (Vol.II, p.[illegible]): "but what? do I meddle this part of my history with the office of preacher?" Fenton's expressed "moral" aim, itself, it will be remembered, intended to cover lasciviousness of portrayal, is curiously revealed as bringing about both the recognition and ignoring of coherence.

In this early period, then, fictionists did not get beyond the boundaries of critical judgment upon technique of structure. They recognized, as has been seen, that cut-and-dried phrases of transition were awkward, they sought to eliminate uninteresting detail, and they apparently knew when they were digressing. If one ask for more theorizing, the sole bit in regard to coherence of structure is a chance remark on the opening pages of Lazarillo de Tormes. But since, as will later become

clear (ch. VIII), this chance phrase passed into a law for the opening of picaresque tales, it is worth the reproduction before passing to the matter of style in fiction--the final subject upon which we have said that the pre-Elizabethan theorists. Hurtado --if Hurtado be the author of the Lazarillo-- wrote: "It seemed to him that he should not begin in the middle, but quite at the beginning, so that there might be a full notice of his personality."

Like the beginnings of theorizing upon "purpose," "fictional truth," and constructive technique, the beginnings of theorizing upon the style proper to fiction are fragmentary. The chief point which can be observed in actual comments is an interesting but transient revolt against turgidity and flowerinoss.

The Greek novel is ornate and tortuous in style. The chivalric romance is heavily commonplace. The pastoral romance is "pretty," but not necessarily "flowery." Unfortunately, there seem to have been no direct statements upon these varying styles. As so often with the novelle of Italy, the case is different." Boccaccio and Bandello placed themselves upon the side of plainness and directness of tone; and neither the periodic Latinized sentences which the former used in all his efforts, nor yet the occasional elaborateness of play upon words or antitheses of the latter, can conceal the general truth of their statements. Until about the middle of the sixteenth century various outcries for "plainness" in fiction may be collected.

Boccaccio himself writes (Decamoron, Introduction to Day IV): "The present novelette.... which not only in vulgar Florentine and in prose and without title are written by me, but which are besides in a style subdued and most humble..." And Bandello thus emphasizes a general claim that he "wrote in the rough:" "I write, not to add adornment to the vulgar tongue, but solely to keep fold in memory of the things which have seemed to me worthy to be written down." Nor, as has been stated, were these two novellieri alone in their turning from affectation. Caxton, e.g., meant to strike a medium between the poor and the stilted, and both Rabelais and the author of Calisto and Melibea seem to have disliked "aureate" diction. Caxton's preface to the Aeneydos runs: "And for as much as this present book is not for a rude uplandish man to labor therein ne read it, but only for a clerk and a noble gentleman that feeleth and understandeth in feats of arms, in love, and in noble chivalry, therefore

in a mean between both I have reduced and translated this said book into our English, not over rude nor curious, but in such terms as shall be understood, by God's grace, according to my copy." Again, in the Calisto and Melibea (1539), the writer has allowed Calisto to speak poetically of the sunset. Thereupon Sempronius breaks out(p. 154): "Good sir, leave off these circumlocutions, leave off these poetical fictions; for that speech is not comely which is not common unto all; which all men partake not of as well as yourself; or which few do but understand. Say, till the sun set, and every one will know what you mean."

It is certainly true that even before 1560 the lovers of directness of fictional style did not have the field to themselves. Various fads from other types of composition were enticing adventurers here and there. But by 1579 all traces of revolt against floweriness and aureateness were fast disappearing. The romance, as early as Herberay's translation of the Amadis (1540) had been purposely"improved" to suit the new taste; and Herberay's theory is still more clearly enunciated before a rifacimento of the Spanish Arnalte and Lucenda, made shortly previous to 1583. The preface to this work asserts: "Inasmuch as such things are put in handsome and elegant style, which will commonly satisfy all, but of a few is contemned and little in favor." This same process of"improving" is recognized in Spain by the person who wrote the preface to the Anvers edition of the Diana in 1575. The first edition of this pastoral had said nothing concerning language; the edition of 1575 apologizes for "el bajo estilo de la obra." "Improvement," however, went on most rapidly and consciously in the French and English paraphrases of Italian novelle. Vigorously Belleforet set about justifying the classical allusions, the beast-bird-plant-and-mineral similes, and the swollen speech of his Histoires Tragiques. His first epistre (1559) contained this: "I pray you.... not to find it ill, if I have not humbled myself to the manner of Bandello; because his style has seemed to me so rude, his words improper, his discourse so badly wrought (ses propos tant mal lies), and his 'sentences' so meager that I have considered it better to mold all anew and to cast it in fresh form." Two years later the young Frenchman went further: "I have embellished the work of the Italian just so and more still." As for England, Painter, Fenton, Pettie, and Whetstone, uniting the streams of French,

Spanish, and Italian influence, which were to fromlen into 'euphuism', prepared the way for him who wished his book to lie "shut in a lady's casket," and him who made stone walls weep at the scourging of Philoclea.[39]

But with Sidney and Lyly the student of the theory of fiction enters a period much more replete with theorists and theorizing than that before their day. It is well from the verge of the newer territory to cast a glance backward upon what has been named --perhaps too daringly-- the critical heritage of prose fiction in 1579. In the first place, five expressed aims of authors have appeared-- amusement, mainly offering the lure of variety of material; edification, touching social reform and religious zeal, but, above all, striving to inculcate morality, and thus forcing "immoral" writers to take the defensive; instruction, now disguising itself under the cloak of pattern characters, now revealing itself boldly in digressive paragraphs; depiction of happenings to contemporaries; and the arousing of emotion. In the second place, the desire to force the belief of the reader has voiced itself in the form of appeal to authority, has contributed to the development of the preface into a first chapter, and has allied itself with theories of the reader's pleasure and the writer's duty. In the third place, a slowly-growing feeling for unity has brought about the departure from set transitional phrases, the expression of objections to over-much detail as tedious and prolix, and the occasional recognition of digression as a mild sin. Finally, the problem of style in fiction has evoked consideration of the value of both directness and ornamentation. Every deduction made, these <u>obiter dicta</u> of fictional theory are not to be disregarded by the historian of the novel.[40]

CHAPTER TWO

THE EXPRESSED AIMS OF PROSE FICTION

Between 1579 and 1740 there occurred not only a merging and even vanishing of earlier types of prose fiction, but also some invention of new types; accordingly, the purposes of this study demand a reclassification of the forms of the longer prose fictions. Of fairly distinguishable types of these are the romance, the realistic narrative, the chronique scandaleuse, the voyage imaginaire, the frame-work conte de fée, and the letter-novel. Romances, furthermore, may be subdivided into seven classes, realistic narrative into four. Not that this classification is made with self-righteous complacency, or is intended to be obligatory upon the student. The basis of the classification has merely been an effort to follow the divisions the fictionists themselves were marking, now in relation to expressed aim, now in relation to the structure of a narrative.[1] Obviously careful definitions of these types of fiction become necessary for the further understanding of the aims of each type.

By the general term, romance, than, is hereafter consistently meant that form of the long prose fiction which has four main features: its chief aim (often unexpressed) is the delight of the reader; it possesses a fairly unified structure; it is essentially grounded on both love and adventure; above all, it employs incidents, characters, machinery, setting, and style, such as were insistently satirized as untrue to life.[2] Under the genus romance may be grouped the following varieties: chivalric, pastoral, allegorical, religious, heroico-historical, informational-conversational, satirical.[3] By realistic narrative, as a term opposed to that of romance is meant a form of the long prose fiction which also has four main features: its chief aim (often unexpressed) is the delight of the reader; it possesses a fairly unified structure; it emphasizes, in one species adventure, in another character; above all, it prides itself upon the depiction of historical and contemporary manners in a method which could not well be satirized as untrue to life. Under the genus realistic narrative may be grouped the picaresque tale, the novel of manners, the historical-psychological novel, and the psychological novel proper. By the chronique scandaleuse[4] is meant a series of indecent stories about historical or

contemporary personages of note-- the stories being told with a malicious and lascivious aim, being loosely connected, being either real or fictitious in content, and being very likely to introduce the supernatural. By the voyage imaginaire is meant a rather unified narrative, invariably carrying the reader into unexplored regions, and aiming, now at amusement through the introduction of the wildly fantastic, now at the social improvement of the human race, now at literary criticism. By the frame-work conte de fée is meant a series of stories dealing with the supernatural in and for itself, and bound within a frame-work tale which motivates the entire series. Finally, by the letter-novel is meant a work either romantic or realistic, having almost any purpose, but constantly assuming a special type of structure-- that of letters exchanged between two or more persons.

It will later become clear (ch. VI) that none of these distinctions were unknown to the fictionists before 1740. At present our problem is that of expressed aim within these numerous types-- the aims or "purposes" of fiction, it will be remembered, being separable into those of amusement, edification, instruction, the depicting of life, and the arousing of emotion. Were fictionists, now, so kind as to have single aims, the matter of determining the purpose of any given type would be easy. Unfortunately, fictionists have complex aims, and, if one is to examine the effect of any given aim upon this or that type of fiction in regard to structure and content, he must proceed cautiously. Perhaps the best way is that here taken-- to elaborate under each of the five "purposes" the attitudes of types to that purpose, and then rapidly to summarize the effect of each "purpose" upon fiction.

One who should reason a priori upon the expressed aim of fiction before 1740 might expect to find amusement of the reader stated as a constant goal. As a matter of fact, the authors are few who dared to confess what, aside from money or fame, must have been the true quest of a vast amount of fiction-writing-- pleasing the public. The source of the reticence of fictionists is naturally worth inquiry. It seems to me that the aim of amusing is in general unstressed, not because of what now-a-days is called its "obviousness," but because of what may be styled the "inherited" need of the justification of fiction in prose. Since the Renaissance imaginative literature as a whole had no longer to parade allegory and "sentences;"

the drama and the epic had unshackled themselves. But the more one scans the reactionary outbursts of such recalcitrants against morality as Hamilton in the Memoirs of Grammont, ponders over the attitude of the French Academy toward Furetière's Roman bourgeois, skims the eight letters of Nicole of the Port Royal against fiction (1665), or eyes the apologies of Lenglet-Dufresnoy (1734) and of Bunyan, the more one comprehends why the huge German romances of Lesen and of Bucholtz are full of praying heroes, and why the Abbé Prevost made his Homme de qualité beg pardon for having in "pious" old age produced such an amorous tale as Manon Lescaut. Nowhere in Europe before 1740 could one write prose fiction without at least a mild blush of shame.[5]

Nevertheless, at times there were revolutionists who wished to see fiction free to entertain and only to entertain. Sidney's much-quoted preface to the Arcadia would seem to speak for romance;[6] but Sidney stands alone amid a host of moralizing romancers. It is the writers of the frame-work conte de fée who revolt most openly; yet in the van, fighting straightforwardly or under shields not difficult to thrust aside, are many of the authors of picaresque narratives and novels of manners. Of the frame-work contes des fées, indeed, the Turkish Tales alone emphasize a didactic aim. For, if Gueullette incidentally mentions the "morality" couched in the Tartarian Tales (1735), his Soirées Bretonnes, his Mogul, Chinese, and Peruvian Tales, as well as Caylus's Nouveaux Contes Orienteaux (1735) make no other claim than to "treat of love innocent and legitimate," or to "prefer le frivole amusant to the things which one calls serious."[7]

The picaro-creators and the novelists of manners are more difficult to place than the inventors of contes des fées. Of the picaro-creators this much may be said of the extremes of the group. The English Faustus-book of 1587 is dismally serious in its asserted intention: "for here we have a wicked example of his writing, promise, and end, that we may remember him, that we go not astray." On the other hand, the Wagner-book of 1593, Nashe in Jacke Wilton,[8] d'Aulnoy in Les Aventures du Baron de Foeneste (1617), and particularly Hamilton in the Memoirs of Grammont are heart-and soul for "delight;" says Hamilton: "I declare that, without troubling myself about

the severe erudition of these last (critics), I write only for the amusement of others." Between the moralizers, however, and the advocates of 'amusement,' range the authors of the most important picaresque narratives; they are one and all believers in Boccaccian defense of Boccaccian practice. Aleman, in Spain, e.g., when annoyed by a continuation of the Guzman d'Alfarache, will tell his reader that he aimed to describe a man who "perfect in his parts and person, furnished with troubles and afflicted with miseries, and falling afterwards into the basest roguery, is put into the gallies." It would be ungracious not to bow silently to Aleman's moral zeal; but this sermon should be compared (preface to Pt. II) with the distortion of the "variety" of the literary banquet Aleman had previously set before the reader (preface to Pt. I). Head in England will likewise inform one that his English Rogue was to have been "burnt in the London Fire" (postscript to Vol. I): a later passage, (preface to Vol. III) throws into amusing relief this exemplary intention: "If any loose word have dropped from my pen, I would have the reader to pass it over regardless, and not, like a toad, only gather up the venom of a garden. However, very cautious I was in offending any honest ear (though sometimes it could hardly be avoided, the matter in a manner requiring it) because I look upon obscene expressions as the plague on payer; and he that comes between the sheets is in danger of being infected." It is not surprising that the novelists of manners seem also to have read Boccaccio. Certainly Greene's dedication to Never too late (1590) has a Boccaccian tone, and it is not only a significant forerunner of Defoe's prefaces, but has its counterpart in substance before Sorel's Polyandre (1648) and Furetiere's Roman bourgeois (1666).[7] "Wherein," declares Greene, "I have discovered as artificially the fraudulent effects of Venus' trumperies and so plainly as on a platform laid open the prejudicial pleasures of love." Again, before the farewell to folly, he sighs: "Follies I term them (Camilla, Pandosto, etc.) because their subjects have been superficial, and their intents amorous."[8] Too often investigators of Greene's "reform" in his last years have overlooked the suggestive advertisement which follows directly: "yet (were they) mixed with such moral principles, that the precepts of virtue seemed to crave pardon for all those vain opinions love set down in his periods."[9]

Naturally, besides admitting that entertainment was his soul or chief end, an

author could announce that "romance" was a secondary aim with him, or he could remain severely silent. The expression of an incidental desire to "delight" is frequent in the romance, with the exception of the chivalric species; it is practically voiced in the allegorical, informational, religious, and satirical romances.[1] In 1636 Digby-Mill long thus prefaced Barclay's Argenis (1621): "it is so full of wise and politic discourses, and these so intermixed and seconded with pleasing accidents, so extolling virtue and depressing vice that.... every reader will be drawn by the delight of something in it, to read the whole." Before Pearsall (1665), an allegory so profound that a preface of nearly 200 pages is necessary to explain the action, Gomberville and Aubignac admits (p.120): "But I shall advise my readers that there are many little circumstances which do not at all contain allegory, and which are only a necessary connections in the composition of the romance, or graces...." Bunyan in his 'Apology' to Pilgrim's Progress becomes poetical:

> "They must be stroked for, and be tickled, too,
> Or they will not be catch'd, whate'er you do."

Barclay says of the Euphormio (1610): "I have sought in all this pleasure and matter for laughter rather than solid and legitimate indictment (of vice)." Why, now, is the aim of amusement so freely confessed by these forms? The answer is evident. All the authors of this group have, as will presently be seen, serious purposes. Yet a moralist like Camus must please in order to instruct, a reformer of society like Fénélon or of literature like Scudéry must hypnotize before he can transform, a hapless lover like Sorel will not be heard by the lofty maid he idolizes unless he conceal his ardor under the paints of study, or to Nicole and the pretense of "amusing" the French queen.

So much for expression, complete or partial, of the desire to entertain. What of the types of fiction that are prone sternly to repress any such claim upon the reader-- the usual chivalric romance, the roman bourgeois, the historical novel, the chronique scandaleuse? So careful citation of prefaces and contents now would be long. Assault upon the "frivolity" of the chivalric romance, particularly the Amadis, was the prevailing literary cry about 1580; as a result, later producers of this type urged that they were ardent in the "reform" of a "useful" kind of fiction. It is

true that in Incisa Sidney, Sidney, and Lord are silent about "reform;" but the great authors of the continent, Cervantes, Du Perier, Scudery, and Sorbière are much exercised. Scudery seems to have grieved over having deepened the immorralities of the period (1654 seq.) by the publication of his Clélie; though, as a matter of fact, the reader of his romance observes that he transformed the "frivolous and foolhardy Amadis to a blameless, noble knight," and pictured the "perfect lover" as an "honorable man in every respect."[14] Sorbière before Hercules and Prince (1663) cries out: "That shamelessly-passionate Amadis-book has many lovers also among the women, of whom, however, none have been bettered through it, but instead several have been urged to unbecoming boldness, when they see painted before their eyes such occurrences.... I do not doubt that the excellent Barclay with his famous Argenis; Lord Sidney with his Arcadia; Aretz with his Orlena.... (who) have torn the Amadis out of the hands of youth.... have not given the slightest incitement (to evil).... but the true fear of God is not ... introduced even in their books.... therefore my mind and perhaps others are not satisfied with these." At least the reader is herewith warned in Christian wise not to read the book in such a way that he take out only the worldly events for his mental delectation and wish to pass over the intermingled spiritual things (sachen, i.e., prayers, etc.)."

If actual zeal for reform may be said to activate the new chivalric romance, no such motive can be assigned for the reticence of the voyage imaginaire, the historical novel, and the chronique scandaleuse in regard to "amusement." The first two of these types sought to be accepted verbatim as records of travels, on the one hand, as authentic documents, on the other; the third of the types was anxious to cover malevolence and shamelessness under a veil of pretended satire. Utopian travels, one may readily believe, were genuinely serious; and, though lighter works, such as the Voyages of Cyrano de Bergerac are often merely whimsical, Gueret, the editor of these last (1656;1657), exhausts himself in praising merits not at all those of "delighting." Consequently, almost anon. in during era the prefaces to such little-known volumes as Travels through Terra Australis Incognita (1684), A Voyage to the World of Cartesius (1691), and Icosaïs (1705). Daniel (if he is the author of the World of Cartesius) hits hard at philosophic mysteries; yet he cannily fishes for readers: "I have made

it my business to diversify and enliven a subject naturally dry and melancholy, as well by the variety of accidents, which give an occasion to digress upon them, as by some peculiar and not inattentive instances of the history of Carthusians." As has been suggested, the prefaces of the historical novelists are in general similar in tone to those of the voyageurs of the period for credence. Sandras, e.g., a prolific author from 1666 to about 1700, emphasizes in Archifort a "moral" aim, in the Avantures of d'Arbagnan a desire to honor that local museum, and in Collange a longing to give to the world information accessible only to him. But everywhere he demands firm belief on the part of the reader (v. ch. III). Into both the novel's beginnings and the historical novel the chronique scandaleuse differentiates itself by its claims. Bussy-Rabutin, indeed, ventures to write thus before his Histoire amoureuse des Gaules (1660): "I engaged myself in writing a history or rather a satirical roman, truly without design of injuring the interested parties, but only to occupy myself two....to give pleasure." The avowed chronique scandaleuse (perhaps recalling Bussy's incarceration in the Bastille) runs no such risk. The Histoire de la Conquête de ..... (1697) passes as a defense of the ladies assailed in the equally virtuous Mémoires de la Vie du Comte de..... (1659). Mme. Durand, attacked by the latter for the malevolence and prurience of the new chronique (1713), defends herself by "the precedent of our great forefathers in satire," and by the asseveration that "whoever is mislead by the consideration of fear, hunger, spiteful causes, recriminations, or the mean hopes of missing pity, has views too dastardly and mercenary for lofty, steadfast souls, who are only agitated by true greatness, by the love of virtue, and the love of glory."[16]

With such citations as these upon the attitude of writers toward the aim of amusement one might continue indefinitely. The purpose of edification-- the second aim which demands attention-- needs fuller analysis. First, however, as has been promised, mention must be accorded the subject which alone can justify this heaping of quotations -- i/e., the effect of the pursuit of the aim of amusement upon the content and structure of fiction.[17]

Decidedly different attitudes toward "amusement," then, bring about decidedly different results. From the group of narratives which asserts that their chief re-

aire was to delight the reader, even the most incoherent fictions: [illegible] Milton, Anglicissimus, the English Acteon, the Memoirs of Brandon, the Persian Tales.[17] In the group which, though subordinating the declaration of "entertainment" to that of "edification," yet admitted "amusement" as a minor aim, two effects become visible: on the one hand,""moral purpose" tended to unify the more important picaresque tales, the heroic romances, and such works as Pilgrim's Progress; on the other, the wish to "draw" militated against informational and corrective digressions. Finally, with the group which heroically discarded the lure of "delight," zeal for reform changed the entire tone of the chivalric romance (v. ch. IV), effort to gain the reader's belief cast the voyage imaginaire into an autobiographical mould, and satirical intention allowed to the chronique scandaleuse lasciviousness of material and disregard of form.

As a standard-bearer for the long file of fictionists who express an"edifying" aim, no more appropriate person could be found than Defoe; from any of his prefaces an excellent "legend" can be unearthed. One [illegible] lines in the Life and Adventures of Duncan Campbell (1720) will serve; the author of this work has (p. 236) "ended all the merriest passages with a sober, instructive, and edifying moral." But on the necessity of this "sober moral" in fiction, so many representatives of so many types of narrative are so thoroughly in accord that one need no longer, as in the case of the aim of amusement, seek the attitude of each type of fiction. All that is necessary is to classify the subspecies of the aim of edification. And these, just as in the period before 1679, may be styled social, religious, and moral. All have greatly broadened in scope since the Renaissance.

The movement for social reform exhibits two minor phases of some interest. The humanitarianism of Dickens, e.g., is at least once forestalled-- and that, oddly enough, by Defoe.[19] An aim more often stated is the establishment of a close relationship between the purpose claimed by satirical comedy, and that asserted by the novel of manners. As early as the Apres dinner (1587) and Sorel's Francion (1623) this tone had been hinted at.[20] In the Roman bourgeois (1666) it is fully enunciated: "I can assure you that it has not been made only for diversion, but that its first design has been to instruct.... there have been very few who censure ordinary faults, which are so

much more dangerous as being more common (than great vices)..... Does one not see every day an infinity of drunkards, bore, misers, petitifogers, braggarts, flirts male and female? Nevertheless, has there been any who dares to advise them of their faults and of their follies, if it has not been comedy or satire? They, leaving to the learned and to magistrates the care of combatting crimes, halt at the correcting of indecencies and ridiculousnesses. They are not less necessary and are often more useful than all the serious discourses.... and as an excellent portrait demands our admiration, though we do not recognize it for the person portrayed, in the same way one can say that fictitious narratives well-written and under assumed names make more impression upon our mind than the true names and true adventures could make."

But of the various movements toward social reform the most significant centered about the voyage imaginaire; from at least as early as 1675 a feeling that the ideal man is the man unspoiled by civilization may be traced. The hermaphrodites among whom Jaques Sadeur (1676) finds unstained innocence, the peaceable race of the Severambians in Australia (1675), the charming sun-worshippers of Ilhos in Prudentio de Lucca (1736), the odd peoples whom Le Nouveau Gulliver encounters-- all these bear witness. The author of Jaques Sadeur, it is true, preserves a cautious silence in his preface; Vairasse, in general most careful not to offend Catholicism, speaks boldly only once in the Severambians; and Berington if Prudentio de Lucca be him-- seldom drops his seemly mask of a Ms. found in the annals of the Inquisition. Desfontaines, however, does not mince words in the introduction to his Nouveau Gulliver: "One will see there the censure of all the policed nations, in the mouth of a virtuous savage, who knows only natural reason and who finds that that which we call civilization (société civile), polish, manners, is only a vicious commerce, which our corruption has invented and which our prejudice makes us esteem."

Defoe spoke not only for the "social" aim in fiction; much more emphatic is his wish to spread religious truths. For instance, the unspeakable sorrow with which he eyes abridged editions of Crusoe is piteous; yet as early as the Storm (1704) he had avowed: "The main inference I shall pretend to make.... in this case, is, the strong evidence God has been pleased to give in this terrible manner to his own Being." But the religious aim is by no means confined to Defoe. It may be said to

have two marked phases; either praise by the author of such monotheistic sentiments as are injected, e.g., into the Cythère of Gomberville (1645), or the setting up of militant sectarianism. And neither Catholics nor Protestants ignored fiction as a vehicle of faith. Before the terrifying mass of Angelo's Pentivolio and Urania (1660) is a preface of many pages, showing that the work is a treatise on reformed Religion.[22] On the other hand, no less a person than the Abbé Prévost governed the tenor of much of his narrative by the desire to instill more orthodox tenets.[23]

It is not difficult briefly to dismiss social and religious aims in pre-Richardsonian fiction; the more general term, moral "purpose," has unexpected ramifications of marked import. For in the moral field the use of characters as examples, good and bad, aroused a continuous tempest; the life-story of the improving or degenerating hero grew popular; volumes were written solely to illustrate certain virtues; the insertion of moral comments into a story was debated pro and con; even chastity of language was a mooted point.

The value claimed for example is perhaps the most common testimony of fictionists to their "moral" aim. The title of Greene's Mirrour of Modestie is characteristic both of him and of this particular plea; "wherein," he insists, "appeareth as in a perfect glass how the Lord delivereth the innocent from all imminent perils, and plagueth the blood-thirsty hypocrites with deserved punishments. Shewing that the gray heads of doting adulterers shall not go with peace into the greve, neither shall the righteous be forsaken in the day of trouble."[24] Latent in this citation, too, lies an issue which has already been touched upon; it is time to elaborate it. Are not gray-headed adulterers and their like better banished from the realms of so formative a power as fiction?

On the affirmative side of this question were marshaled in France d'Urfé, Gerzan,[25] Gomberville, and other romancers; in Germany Lesen; and in England the anonymous author of the Love Storma. This last writer, indeed, is inclined to go as far as a modern Sunday-school novelist; his unwieldy volumes are preeminently pure, and his aim is candidly announced: "The argument of this book is the history of a life that is free, that has received a liberal education, and has been well and religious-

ly brought up; it keeps within the bounds of the humanly possible, and deals, as a rule, with the middle class." The brief for the negative of the issue contained, as might be surmised, a variety of defenses. Using with seeming seriousness the grinning apologies of Boccaccio and other Renaissance novellieri, are Clemen, Head, and perhaps Quevedo. Hamilton has already been seen treading into open defiance of the moralists, and he is amply supported by the Zolaesque Des Challes; before his Les Illustres Françaises (1713) the latter pleads for "une morale plus naturelle": "Here are, I believe, a good part of the occurrences which are ordinarily found in the world; and the moral that one can draw from them is so much the more sensible, as it is founded upon certain facts." The facts are so thoroughly "realistic" that they may well be passed by. On a quite different tack from either the mockers or the rebels are the writers who, like Du Verdier (v. note 13, ch. II), honestly defended the Amadis, or who, like Furetière, suggested that the Amadis was harmless because its characters were shadows whom no one would imitate. But Camus, almost alone, seems to have struck a modern attitude-- that art is free to use what art will, in accordance with a healthy conscience. In my judgment this now forgotten bishop meant every word he uttered when he said (Cléoreste, Vol. II, p. 730 (ed. 1626)): "If I dip in the ordures of the world, if I represent evil actions and even unchaste ones (deshonnestes), although very rarely, in order to make them detested, and through bloody invectives which I make against vice purge the world of its corrupt manners, why will any one blame this labor?" As far as I know, the sole advance upon this point of view before 1740 is Prevost's comment before Manon Lescaut (1732): "But experience is not an advantage which ought to be free to all the world to give itself; there remains then only example which can serve as a rule."

The use of the good or bad character as an example easily passed into the presentation of a life-story. The creators of picaros are again to the front; smilingly they inform their readers that they have doomed their heroes --were it not for ill-mannered and ill-moraled sequels fro other lands-- to end in the galleys (Guzman d'Alfarache), in a holocaust (English rogue), or, at best, in dire distress (Moxham). The maintenance of a less piquant procedure, the slow unfettering of a sin-bound nature, is manifest in Gil Blas and in Crebillon's Lettres de Cléocour (1735). Le

...ge's parable about the two scholars of ...rance, given in the preface to Gil Blas, is accepted as good moral coin by such an investigator as Breton in his Le Roman au 17ème Siècle; be that as it may, Gil's comments upon himself are worthy of notice. He falls reluctantly; as late as Vol. II, p. 70, "he is shocked by..... faults (of the comedians); but I found, by misfortune, their fashion of living a little too rude to my taste, and I plunged myself into debauchery;" finally, at the close of the tale, Gil settles down reformed. As for Crebillon, his theory, since he had considerable influence, is more interesting than his asserted motive is trustworthy. The Comte de Meilcoeur was never finished by its author; but he stated as his thesis the regeneration of a man, who through ignorance of that which is really worth while, becomes proud and debauched, and is saved form this deadly condition only by love for "une femme estimable."

Example and life-story were not the sole resources of moral-loving writers of fiction. At times books were written to exploit special virtues. Greene pens triumphantly Penelope's Web, "wherein a crystal mirror of feminine perfection represents to the views of every one those virtues and graces, which more curiously beautifies the mind of women, than either sumptuous apparel, or jewels of inestimable value: the one buying fame with honor, the other breeding a kind of delight, but with repentance. In three several discourses also are three special virtues.... pithily discussed: namely, Obedience, Chastity, and Silence." Camus's moral campaigns of this type are quite as interesting and much more reliable. Among them are La Mémoire de Darie (1620), "where one will see the pattern of a devoted life and a religious death;" Palombe (1624), "containing the purity of marriage and the honoring of a model wife;" Dioreste (1626), "the image of a perfect friendship, crowned and concluded with the holy alliance between some French and Spanish (lovers)."

A fourth device of the "moral fictionists," the insertion into the body of a narrative of comments by the author or by a character used as the author's mouthpiece, gradually met with disfavor. Euphues illustrates this sandbagging of the reader, carried to an extreme. The well-known "caveat," even though it follows the Euphues proper, is at least attached to Lyly's story; accordingly, the reader of the Euphues feels that he is neglecting his duty, if he ignores the admonition (p.259): "And

calling to mind his former loosenes., and how in his youth he had misspent his time, he thought to give a caveat to all parents, how they might bring their children up." Aside from this passage, the introduction to the Euphues furnishes cheerful proof of the need to tabulate this work under the informational-conversational romance. "These discourses," riddles Lyly, "I have not clapped in a cluster, thinking with myself that ladies had rather be sprinkled with sweet water than washed, so that I have sowed them here and there, like strawberries, not in heaps, like hops." Later, in the picaresque narratives of Spain, in Barclay's Argenis, and in Sorel's Francion (1622), this crude means of edification is similarly, if less alliteratively, compounded; but Sorel remarks: 'there are some remonstrances, which, although they are short, will not fail to touch the soul vividly/" That "short" is the first instance I have observed of a revolt against the custom--- a revolt which with Le Sage's translation of Guzman d'Alfarache is very evident; Le Sage writes of these "delectable bits," as an earlier translator had called them: "But the author ought to restrain himself from these ingenious sermons (leçons), which Persius calls with perfect truth 'une règle qui trompe,' and not cut at every moment the thread of the adventures of his hero, in order to throw himself into long harangues against manners." Yet the revolt was far from being universal; of Robinson Crusoe the plit Defoe wrote a score of years later: "this makes the abridging of this work as scandalous as it is knavish and ridiculous, seeing.... they strip it of all those reflections, as well religious as moral, which are not only the greatest beauty of the work, but are calculated for the infinite advantage of the reader."[3]

It is not amazing that in conjunction with all the other tricks for foisting morality upon readers the matter of diction should have been aired. Just what motive lay behind the movement to purify the language of characters from the "offensive" one can but ponder. In any event, quite apart from that dubious cleanliness of speech which was championed by Sorel, Head, and Defoe, and which needs no particular comment, there was such a movement.[32] Lyly is quite honest in saying: "For this I have diligently observed, that there shall be nothing found, that may offend the ch chaste mind, with unseemly terms or uncleanly talk." D'Urfé's words are sincere (l'Astrée, preface to t.III): "and be assured, my dear Lignon, that they (Diana and

her nymphs) will find there no single thought that can offend their chaste and modest ears." It would be cruel as well as injust to deny the one feeble merit of Baron's Cyprian Academy (1648):

"No word obscene, no phrase lascivious,
You here shall read, to taint a virgin's blush."[33]

Not, indeed, until the stately edifice of heroical-historical romance tottered, and the mémoire secrète, like some vermin, crept from the ruins, did malicious nastiness of phrase and scene replace the "propriety" of the "princely" fictions.

Material enough has now been presented to allow of the question: how do all these quotations upon moral aim bear upon the development of prose fiction?[34] Many implications the reader only slightly acquainted with 17th century fiction will discover for himself.[35] Three effects of theorizing, however, are so important as to demand considerable amplification. The desire to picture Utopias, for instance, had a disintegrating influence upon all the lesser voyages imaginaires. Without exception, the New Atlantis, Les Iles Ardoer, the Nouvelles Iles, Fantastic de Lucca, Le Nouveau Gulliver are broken by digressions grafted to the purpose of composition. Within this same group, yet another factor entirely due to the "wish to be believed" aided incoherence. Frequently the voyage imaginaire, in order to be accepted as veritable, passed as being edited from a Ms., often fragmentary. In more than one case, accordingly, prefaces and foot-notes cite breaks in the text as conclusive proof that these narratives are authentic. Responsibility for form, of course, rested nowhere. It seems hardly necessary to add that a precisely similar situation prevailed in many historical novels.

A second marked effect upon fiction was brought about by postulating a resemblance in function between comedy and the novels of manners. Comedy had, in satirizing, presented life as it is. Fiction, then, in many cases wished to present life as it is. The outcomes were various. Since life is apparently rather chaotic, more than one novel of manners (v. ch. VI) is intendedly chaotic. On the other hand, when occasionally a writer chose to present life as it seemed to one man or woman, rising or falling amid its turmoil, there resulted a rough unity. Vividly depicted though Moll Flanders and Gil Blas are, they are of scarcely less significance in

their stressing of a coherence which, in the hands of Fielding, became plot. Besides, defects in structure are perhaps overbalanced by the fact that these early novels of manners became the ancestors of the local-color ephemerae of our day. To employ contemporary coloring which is still admitted as accurate was no small service to fiction in the era of Scuderyville and Mlle. de Scudery.

The third effect upon fiction sprang from the struggle for unity. To the champions of chastity return will be made (ch. 37). Now is there need for repetition of the views of the men who stood for freedom and license-- for "art for art's sake." The upshot of the warfare between insipid purity and unbounded licentiousness of treatment was that there gradually arose writers who used what shades of good and evil they selected through force of genius, and who employed these shades as the greatest geniuses always employ them-- without abuse. One thinks, of course, of the Princesse de Clèves, of Manon Lescaut, of Corinne, of Tom Jones, of the Nouvelle Héloïse.[37]

From time to time, perhaps, the attentive reader may have noted in the course of the discussion of the leading aims of prose fiction -- amusement and edification-- that quotations have been used which might well be applied to other purposes earlier distinguished from these two. Such purposes were to give information, to depict life as it is, and to arouse emotion.

Until one has classified the remarkable branchings of the first of these three aims, one can have no idea of its hold upon early prose fiction. Indeed, the main reason for examining this desire to impart information is that only thus can be grasped the debt which is owed to the long romances of Calprenède by the slowly-emerging theory of unity. For these and these almost alone, save for the early romances of Mlle. de Scudéry, kept themselves free from the flotsam of the sea of instruction; yet, strangely enough, these romances are still spoken of as hopelessly adrift in a literary Sargasso. Nor is the full extent of their service clear until one proceeds from the less inimical to the more astounding types of informational insertion.

[38]

At once may be premised that instruction is not always advanced as an end, and

that, even this so advanced, it is somewhat difficult to separate from the social, religious, and moral aims expressed by fictionists.[39] The inculcation of proper behavior, whether in the form of advice to a courtier or instructions to a sailor, seems the informational "purpose" least detrimental to unity. "Read," advises Harvey in Pierce's Supererogation, "the Countess of Lemaroke's Arcadia.... for three things especially very notable.... for amorous courting.... for sage counseling.... for valorous fighting.... and delightful pastime by way of pastoral exercise may pass for the fourth." Explains Le Sage before his Aventures du Seigneur Gonzalès (1734): "Another motive still incites him to this work, which is viewed as useful to society; he fancied that one would get an infinite pleasure (surait un plaisir infini) from the minutest details that he gave of the encounters in which he had commanded; because, according to him, a post-captain and a simple chevalier (patron de barque) ought to have as much prudence, address, and courage in their conduct as an admiral in his."

Discourses upon religious freedom, upon philosophy, and especially upon monarchy versus democracy have already been noted (v. p.) in the political motto of that "sweet nut," Barclay's Argenis.[40] In similar fashion and likewise in accordance with their expressed theory, the Utopian voyages and the allegorical, religious, and informational romances include digressions upon government. Political aim, too, directs the Médici of Grenoble (1693): "I have chosen in the secret authors the secret intrigues of the most famous conspiracies, and I have reduced them to small and specific histories (histoires particulières), in which, besides the pleasure of the singular events mingled with love-intrigues, a hope there will be found also that political finesse (politique la plus fine)...." Les Amours d'Anne d'Autriche,[41] in offering the following history," intends to "develop the iniquitous mystery of the veritable origin of Louis XIV, disturber of public repose." Finally, a less unseemly political theme is that of patriotism. The Astrée is to celebrate, says d'Urfé, not an Italian Arcadia, but the banks of his cherished Lignon; Gerzan intended to cap his other romances (1636-1655) with a Histoire Gauloise; Desfrenèis states before Raymond (1656) that from all Europe and Asia he has chosen France for the theater of his action, in order that he might gratify national pride; and Bucholtz confesses in the preface to Herculeo and Valisca (1659): "I suspect that the love of my country has

built this Christlike German Hercules in my soul.... without doubt our Germany also fostered in those times many brave heroes and princes, whose fame the envy of foreigners (Deutschen) and the lack of historians suppressed, and delivered to oblivion."[42]

Yet other distinguishable goals of the aim to inform are the insertion of scientific, philosophical, and critical knowledge. Of the last of these three sides of the instructional "purpose" enough will be said in ch. IV; of the other two pleas the New Atlantis of Bacon, the Voyage to the Moon and to the Sun of Cyrano de Bergerac, and the Voyage to the Land of Certains (Tan) afford ample proof. The New Atlantis has, however, no preface, and the views of the erudite Cyrano are expressed only through his contemporary editors, Le Bret and Rosand.[43] Of Tanis's theory, already quoted (p.27), the ascertainable result is that the really clever story occupies about one-sixth of a volume of 330 pages. Without more evidence, it must at least moderately clear to the student that in a broad way the instructional aim may be characterized as disastrous to coherence, indeed, to the progress of fiction,[44] providing that some slight contributions to a theory or code can be ignored.[45]

Sufficient has been said regarding the aims of amusement, edification, and information. Never, according to my knowledge, did either of the purposes of fiction still to be treated --the depiction of life and the awakening of emotion-- appear as the sole goals of any author. Furthermore, the terms of these aims need not be followed minutely. Its keenest champions, Sorel, Scarron, Furetière, Le Sage, Defoe, and Marivaux have been noticed in the discussion of the dependence of the novel of manners upon satirical comedy; and their at so many beneficial influences upon structure, as well as their highly-desirable drift toward "realism" in incident, character, background, and style may be seen in almost any of their productions. Not touched upon as yet, however, is the suggestion in Maréschal's Chrysolite (1.7) of the need of accuracy in the analysis of human emotion; Maréschal's theory, unfortunately, does not reveal his genius as a psychologist (v. ch. VI). He merely remarks: "In others you will see only inflated balloons in the air which burst into atoms, monsters composed of a thousand contradictions.... here I have put nothing save what a man can do, I hold myself in the limits of a private life.... and I make

use of antiquity (the scene is in Athens) only to lend glamour (donner un couleur étrangère) to the good or evil of our age." Of significance, also, is the promise of the historical romance: the novel to picture faithfully the events of the past. It will be seen (ch.V) that this means comparatively little in the long romances; but in such efforts as Boyle's Lesdor and Edmund (1697) in England and the d'Aulnoy's Comte de Warwick (1703) in France, there is a true attempt to visualize earlier centuries. The idea itself had found perhaps its first utterance in 1688 in the forgery, which for nearly a century passed as a [illegible] novel-- the Du Vraict et parfait amour. Here one is told: "The period, however, and the persons of whom it makes mention, agree very well one with the other, which would make us judge the narration (recital) rather a history than a fiction (fable)."[46]

Not before 1713 does the Aristotelian theory of the arousing of the reader's emotion seem to have been again elaborated. Undoubtedly there are hints as to the necessity of this aim scattered here and there; but in Lamothe, as will be seen, Mlle. de Scudéry wrought emotion into the intricate web of her theories. Moreover, there must be material which I have not found in some of the many imitations of the Portuguese Letters (1669) and the Princesse de Clèves (1678). One text is it may, the preface to the Aventures de .... (1713), attributed to Varignon in the Bibliothèque du Roi of 1753, lays unmistakable emphasis upon the means of touching the reader's emotions. The most pregnant words are these: "The pity which the object excites when present, the inquietudes which it causes us, afflict the soul with various (fâcheuses) impressions. It is softened; but it really suffers. The emotion is painful (le sentiment est triste); whereas, the simple recital, however frightful it may be, if it excites pity, carries into the soul only a compassionate interest without grief (douleur). One sighs with those who suffer; one is to sigh; but as their evils are only feigned, the moved soul (l'âme émue) gets a pleasure out of its sensibility, in protecting itself through reason from veritable sadness, which ought to occupy it only at the real presence (réalité) of misfortune." It is probably not by chance that the author follows this Aristotelian explanation with citations from Greek tragedy.

For a second time we are upon a borderland-- not now, however, between the crit

icism of an earlier and a later period, but between two sections of the same period. It is indubitable, surely, that since 1879 great strides in the discussion of the "purposes" of fiction have been made. The aim of amusement is still, it is true, less stressed than edification; but it is defended not only under cover, as before 1879, but in the open. The social aims of fiction have broadened into an occasional demand for special reforms, and the cry of "return to nature" has been sounded. Religious aims have produced both idealizing and controversial narratives. Both these groups have almost exhausted the arguments regarding the use of examples in character; have exploited, on this hand the presentation of the character who represents but one virtue, on that character in evolution; have begun to question the expediency of the "edifying insertion;" and have, finally, faced the crux of purity in scene and phrase. Instructional aims, also, have widened as man's interests have grown; the prose narrative has not only been reimpressed into the service of the teaching of practical etiquette, but has been called to the aid of philosophy, history, economics, geography, physical science, criticism, and even fashion. The aim of depicting life has, in its turn, caused speculation upon the meaning of "realism" both for the outer and the inner life, both for contemporary and historical events. Alone, the arousing of emotion --the one distinctly aesthetic aim-- has received scant attention. More significant, however, than all this theorizing upon the aims of fiction has been the effect of it upon the form and substance of narrative. The wish for variety of material and the intention of presenting character only in order to satirize it have alike worked for incoherence of structure; so has the insertion into a story of moral and informational comment. On the other hand, certain forces have tended to preserve unity of composition-- the employment, e.g., of an autobiographical method of relation by which one sought to be believed, the reproduction of the life-story of a rising or falling hero, the dislike of many of the romancers for material not directly narrative. Aside from the problem of form, the desire to depict the world as it is has broken the way for later realists; and the struggle for purity has pointed the path which is to be trod both by the genuinely psychological novel and by the decent, but virile novel of manners.

Ch. II: Ch. [illegible]

The Conscious Effort to Gain Belief

When a fictionist sets out to induce his reader to believe all that is written, he makes an effort which is at possibly to mingle with the progressed aims of pseudo fiction which have been thus far discussed. Nevertheless, such devices as are developed in this effort seem to merit attention rather as what has been called an "aspect of realism" (v. ch. I) than as a "purpose." It may be, again, that these devices would by some be considered as falling, not under expressed theory, but under practice. I can only repeat what I have said in regard to traditional phrases-- that in a judgment the materials which is to follow can not be ignored by any collection of expressed theory. For the effects of the views which must underlie this material are to be seen not only in the transformation of the preface to a fiction into what is practically a first chapter, but also in the choice of content and method of composition of volume after volume.

The most simple form of the conscious effort to gain the reader's belief is not often used from 1671-1740; it consists of the query: why should a reader not accept the marvels related of former age or a distant land? The editor of "Captain Dillon's [illegible]," the new [illegible] (1675), declares that it is a mark of constancy to refuse credence to all wonder-breeding narratives-- for even he judicially approves of not "receiving everything implicitly;" nor he cites in support of his view the confusion of those who once denied the existence of the Antipodes and of Peru. The writer of Pneumatologia (1678) also expostulates; "There is," he states, "such an innate principle in the hearts of most men, that they are apt to admit nothing for current, but what is obvious; nor reckon anything credible, unless it be visible; but seeing almost every climate doth afford something rare and unusual, it avails with reason, that some climates should in especial manner produce some more extraordinary novelty, if not to others incredible, yet at least wonderful, and not easily [illegible] for a truth." Yet even of these authors neither relied wholly upon such arguments. The movement of which their asseverations were a part was too ingeniously complex-- boldly asserting veracity, heaping up lists of "authorities," [illegible], and delighting,

in many cases, in a most intricate concealment of author behind fiction, rumors, and traitors of ass.

As has already been indicated concerning Sandilo and others, authors' declarations of veracity were frequent before 1670; but it is after that date that three motives governing this verocity are loudly proclaimed-- the weakness of lying; the distinct utility of truthful narratives; and the pleasure that attends a reader. To these motives return will be made. At present the preliminaries must be required attention. The servant of Sorbière (1654), a tiny tale which may be fiction, but is suspiciously akin to an historical tract, is thus solemnly prefaced: "The just reward of him that is accustomed to lie is, not to be believed when he speaketh the truth.... Let not our present truth plead for any former falsehood's sake. The country is near us, Sussex; the time present, June; the subject, a serpent; strange, yet now a neighbor to us; but it were more than a prodigy to forge it in our days, that every man might turn in iur throats; believe it, or read it (Reading), for I believe you that read this little all, thou art not doubt of one, but believe that there are many serpents in Reading." And after like assertions of veracity can be gathered at random from every type of fiction from the French-romans de fée, and the pastoral, historical, and satirical romances. Calprenède, Scudéry, Barclay, Ramsay, Head, Feuber, Bovorgne, Aeon, Dumas, Mme. D'Aulnoy, the Comtesse de Murat, Lenoble, Mrs. Behn, Mrs. Rubin, Furetière, Prévost, Privat, Mrs. Manley, Defoe, Swift-- these names barely begin the list. Four of the declarations may be reproduced as typical of various groups of authors. Furetière and Mrs. Behn well represent general statements. "But it is not," confides the former in a criticism of romances before it. All of the Roman Comique (1666), "the same with this very veritable and very sincere recital, to which I give only form, without altering in any way the matter. These are little histories and adventures happened in divers quarters of the city, which have nothing in common, and which I try to bring nearer, one to the other, as much as is possible." "I do not pretend," declares the author of Oroonoko (1653), "to entertain my reader with the adventures of a feigned hero, nor, in recording the truth, design to adorn it with any accidents but such as arrived in earnest to him." More definite than the words of Furetière and Mrs. Behn are the

comments of Camus and Bunyan. "It is little enough," suggests Camus in 1626 in Cléopâtre (Vol.II,p.731), "to see only the walls, if one does not inquire about (si l'on ne s'enquiert des) the manners of the inhabitants; because one sees the live stones which compose families and cities.... it was in this trip that I learned besides the Cléopâtre and the Iphimède, the histories of Artistomire and of Stromate." Then," attests Bunyan before Mr. Valiant (1683), "I thinks (for I may tell you, that in the midst of my relations, all the things that here I discourse of, I was as to matter of fact, have been acted upon the stage of this world, over many times before mine eyes."

Naturally, more effective than mere assertion of veracity was the incorporation of "authorities" for one's statements. Sometimes this 'trick' was confined, as before 1579, to the use of marginal references or to casual passages about "ancient chronicles;" more often it advanced to collation of groups of"authorities." The mention of "chronicles," e.g., descended from the romans and the harangue to the pages of Nervèze, Sorel, and Scudéry in England, Cervantes in Spain, and Du Perier and Scudéry in France; the Iroïde is not without citation of "records," and the hero of Polexandre (1632) is a descendant of one Marcus of Arlon, apparently as prolific a memoirist as his author was a letter-writer in hers. As for the marginal reference, Scudéry and Granet (1641) and Desfora and Jacques (1657) bristle with such proofs of erudition.

Rejection by historical authority was scarcely needed, as is evident, in the case of the autobiographical picaresque tale, the contemporary novel of manners, and the psychological novel. On the other hand, it stood as a rampart in front of the voyage imaginaire. Yet frowned time and authority fortress before the historical novel. From 1579-1728 (when a change occurs) the voyage imaginaire is seldom content unless it cites the works of travellers whose accounts were admitted to be authentic. Lebret in 1650, while granting the existence of fabulous matter in Cyrano's Voyage to the Moon, nevertheless adds: "I shall say.... that his chimaera is not so absolutely devoid of verisimilitude that between several great men, ancient and modern, there have not been some who believed that the moon was a habitable world." The author of Voyage Inouï (1678) adduces Marco Polo, Fernandez Navarro, le Muir, Jean de Torrès,

etc. In certain (1737), are ranged "authors of greatest antiquity;" and in the Nouveau Gulliver (1738) and Aventures de Lucon (1738), the reader is favored with learned foot-notes.

The historical novel is in general [illegible] the term *romance*. Defoe, St. Real, and Prévost, perhaps best represent the situation from 1672 onward. Defoe's Storm, even though in no sense an historical novel, happens to contain a more significant remark than any of his works which might be so classed. "When a story," he says, "is vouched with sufficient authority, he (the relator) ought to give the world the testimonial of its proper voucher, or else he is not just to the story; and where it comes without such sufficient authority, he ought to say so; otherwise, he is not just to himself. In the first case he injures the history, by leaving it doubtful where it might be confirmed past all cases of question; in the last he injures his own reputation, by taking upon himself the risk, in case it proves a mistake, of having the world charge him with a forgery." Undoubtedly Saint-Réal, bolstering up his Don Carlos (1672), has much the same thing in mind when he exhaustively piles source upon source in the preface; "this history," he tells us, is drawn from all the authors, Spanish, French, Italian, and Irish, who have written upon the war in which it occurred." Prévost, particularly in Cleveland (1731), surpassed all his predecessors. Having detected in certain memoirs sent to him discrepancies from such historians as Burnet and Clarendon, he rejoices that he has been so fortunate as to find in the works of a "Docteur Welwood" corroboration of the account in the "memoirs" of the death of the second son of Cleveland, the natural son of Cromwell! He is even willing to quote at length from "Docteur Welwood." Lies and not sincere theory, and as such to be swept aside by the gatherer of comment? Of course these remarks of Defoe and Prévost are "lies;" but all the more because they were lies they affected the content and structure of the historical novel in the period before Richardson.[6]

The "lies" did not stop with the assertions of veracity and with the display of "authorities." Nor the zealous upholders of "truth" in fiction recognizes a valuable asset in the unearthing of lost memoirs-- a distinction of terms which is one of name only. It is difficult to decide how far the remarkably detailed prefaces

of the voyage imaginaire after 1670 were influenced by the prefaces to Greek novels, to such imitations of these as Du Vraict et Parfait Amour (1569), and to such romances as Las Sergas de Esplandian (1487); influence, certainly, must be allowed to the pretenses of Mss. upon which Don Quixote, Simplicissimus (1669), and Gomales' Voyage to the Moon (pub. 1638).[7] In any event, the first startlingly elaborate account of a Ms. seems to be that in the preface to the Sevarambians (1675)-- a volume which, as has been noted, employed other schemes to secure belief. The story of the Ms. is retailed agreeably and at length. After the "editor's" comment that Captain Siden's tale of the Sevarambians of "undiscovered Australia" has "all the characters of a true relation," the reader is informed that the author has been killed in the "recent naval battle" between the English and the Dutch. The Ms. itself has passed from the hands of Siden's physician to those of the writer of the preface, one Thomas Skinner, who has it "now" (1672) ready for publication; the physician, it seems, having wisely refused to attempt the translation of the "memoirs" from their polyglot of "Latin, French, Italian, Dutch." Aside from all this, the condition of the Ms. is advanced as proof of its genuineness. For instance, inserted in the text, pp. 411-412, is a paragraph which describes the collation of the "memoirs" as having been especially difficult, since they "were intended for his own use rather than that of the public," comments, in addition, upon the lack of "exactness" in certain portions of the Ms., and adds, finally, "he hath passed over in silence some affairs which ought to have been particularly described in an exact and complete history, and even sometimes omitted to explain words and things which he never afterward speaks of , as divers epithets of the Sun and some other matters."

At once, upon the publication of the exceedingly popular Sevarambians, the highly-developed preface became a constant feature of the voyage imaginaire; it reached its culmination for this type of prose fiction in Gaudentio de Lucca,[8] wherein it is absolutely necessary for the comprehension of the narrative. But it was not confined to the voyage imaginaire. Though the long romances do not seem to have been affected, the historical novels, the chroniques scandaleuses, the frame-work contes des fees, and, in especial, the picaresque tales and the novels of manners by such

important authors as Defoe, Prévost, and Marivaux speedily adopted the device. It is not at all unlikely that Richardson borrowed either from them or from Montesquieu's Lettres Persanes the idea for the preface of Pamela. Each of the forms mentioned merits detailed discussion-- except, perhaps, the frame-work Contes de fées.

The historical novel uses the Ms. in a fashion too complicated to be analyzed at length. Three methods of employment, however, can be illustrated by quotation concerning theory. In its baldest form, the historical "memoir" prided itself upon an incoherence due to close allegiance to some one Ms.; in La Tour Ténébreuse, e.g., Mlle. L'Héritier prefers writing a "volume" which should be accused of "over-fidelity to history" rather than one which might be called a "histoire romanesque." An advance upon this is the method of collation claimed by Sandras-- the use of material which is always that of some authority, yet not always that of the same authority. Though there is already, he declares (1686), a life of Admiral Coligny, the writer of this "lacked, perhaps, of having good memoirs.... I have several Memoirs between my hands, and no one will be astonished, when I shall have said that I am of a house which has been a friend of his, and to which the Admiral several times has revealed his most secret plans."[9] A still more modern method is that of Mme. d'Aulnoy in her earlier fictions, where she makes little pretense of doing more than following the substance of her "authorities;" and in Le Comte de Warwick (1704) she appears boldly as a transformer of history.

The probable reason for this final admission of Mme. d'Aulnoy was the connection of her name and signature (Mme. D....) with the chronique scandaleuse, which had seized with avidity upon this scheme for escaping responsibility. The claim of being a translator or an editor was made to cover the most grievous attacks upon historical and contemporary celebrities. Les Amours de Henri IV (1695), Ismael, Prince de Maroc (1693), the Secret History of Europe (1734)-- these and many other such works all rely upon "authentic memoirs." "A part of" the papers relating to the "reign of Cha-Sephi I" (Mémoires Secrets de la Cour Perse, 1746) are translated from the secret journals of Ali-Coulikan, "First Secretary at Ispahan;" Mrs. Manley's Memoirs of Europe at the Close of the 8th Century are foisted upon Eginhard, who seems to

have left a Ms. in 'obsolete French,' so valuable that it had been placed in the University of Pavia, etc., etc. Indeed, so notorious did the untruth and malice of the "memoir" become that the Mémoires de la Vie du Comte D.... (1696), which presents anything but a flattering picture of two-score women, drew from the Comtesse de M.... a speedy retort. The preface is significant: "Although every one is persuaded that these Memoirs (of Comte D....) are only a collection of adventures drawn from several romans...."

It is pleasant in grouping citations about the "use of the Ms." to turn from these malodorous works of scandal to the pages of those writers who best indicate the real force of the movement-- Defoe, Prévost, and Marivaux. Well known are the amazing series of Defoe's fore-words, and the preface to Marivaux's Marianne, --printed, one notes, as the opening of the narrative itself. The volumes of the Abbé Prévost are perhaps less familiar. The Mémoires d'un homme de qualité (1728 seq.) fell into his hands, he says, as the result of a much-motived visit to the Abbaye de...., where lived a famous recluse, whose name he has promised to conceal. The Mémoires, if Prévost may be trusted, were so popular that there is no modern "best-seller" but must envy their editor. No sooner were a portion of them upon the market than a grandson of Cromwell, "who lives actually in London," was so pleased with the editorial grace that he turned over to Prévost the Mémoires of his father, one Cleveland, the natural son of the stern Oliver. Nor was the end yet. In 1735 the sons of the Doyen de Killerine came to feel that he who had edited the Mémoires de Cleveland was best fitted "advantageously to retouch" the Ms. left by their father. It is of moment that the conscientious editorial hands of Prévost carefully indicate "retouchings" in all the novels.

Still it was not sufficient for the tireless truth-seekers that hidden corners and generous strangers yielded Mss. and Memoirs to their disinterested grasp. From the first the example of the Utopia (v. p. 11) was followed, and there ensued an effort both to portray and eulogize"authors" and"editors." In Don Quixote Cid Hamete Benengeli appears whenever Cervantes wishes to strike back at his ill-wishers. Again, however, the real force of the movement to vouch for "authors" is apparent only after 1670. In order to uphold his character for truthfulness Jaques Sadeur

(1675) is made to write thus of crocodiles: "I inquired with great care where were the crocodiles that historians locate in large numbers in these parts.... they glory so much in this license (of lying) that they affect almost nothing but fictions." Similarly, the author of the Nouveau Gulliver (1715), though he cites with gusto the "authorities" who attest to the existence of most of his marvellous isles, is discreet in the case of the Terre du Feu; this is described by a "rescued Rollander," lest "these bizarre fancies make our voyager depart from his character of sincerity." More daring is the stroke of Sandras in Rochefort (1691): "his testimony entirely alone suffices to convince the most incredulous." One need not quote the famous preface to Mrs. Veal,[13] or that to Gulliver's Travels with its "proverb" among the "neighbors at Redriff." But a genuine triumph in the archives of the testimonials to an author's veracity is that of Mlle. l'Heritier in Guy Joli (168?). She as editress of the author's ms. makes capital of his ill-humor: "(he has) an air of sincerity which pleases except toward the end of the work, where the malignity of the satirical hits which he dispenses upon the Cardinal de Retz makes one doubt of the good faith of the historian."

Side by side with attestation to the character of an "author" of a ms. advanced a desire to portray him; again, almost the first extant instance after 1675 is the detail already quoted concerning Siden, discovere of the land of the Sevarambians (1675). Varieties of depicting can here only be hinted at. The vivid detailing of the personality of the "recluse" who, according to Prévost, wrote the Mémoires d'un Homme de Qualité; the insertion into Mlle. l'Héritier's La Tour Ténébreuse of the Provençal songs of Richard I, its nominal "author;" the description which Marianne gives of herself at the opening of the ms. "found" by Marivaux; above all, the minute account of the appearance of Gaudentio de Lucca-- these are a few of the many ruses supposed to aid in capturing the reader's assent. Somewhat different from any of these "tricks" is the concealment of personality made so much of in the Mémoires de la vie du Comte [illegible][14] (1696), and in Defoe's Moll Flanders or Roxana.

A supplement to the eulogizing and portraying of "authors" was the subpoenaing of contemporary witnesses. Already citation has been given from the preface to the Serpent of Horsham (1614), in which "people" are mentioned as having knowledge of

the "facts." After 1673 the witnesses to this or that narrative are [illegible]. Mrs. Behn in the Fair Jilt (Works, Vol. I, p.275) summons a "friar yet living in Antwerp." "Mynheer van [illegible], Advocate for the East India Company," swears to the sailing of the "Golden Dragon, bound for Batavia"-- that renowned ship which bore the hero of the Sevarambians. "My Lord ...." appears opportunely for the purposes of the person who wrote A Key on the Conjurer (1713). Authentic de Luce is vouched for by officials of sonorous title. One venture, fit forever to silence any caviler who scraped acquaintance with the beau monde, is that of Casanova before the Marquis de Montbrun (1753): "There is not any one who has not known" him-- this man who beat Charles II 50000 crowns![15]

The personality of the "editor" of a ms. did not receive so much attention as that of the "author." But there can be no need to delay upon such devices as the claim of Defoe to have expurgated the mss., left by Moll Flanders and Roxana, "ladies of gayety;" the laborious researches of Prévost in "verifying" the life-story of Cleveland; the criticism by Swift of the text of Gulliver's Travels;[16] or the alteration by Marivaux of the only two names in Marianne, which it would be impolitic to publish. The preface to Defoe's Memoirs of a Cavalier (1707) is typical not only of the cleverness of those from whom the wily Englishman borrowed his guile, but also of those who borrowed from him: "the persons now concerned in the publication assure the reader that they have had them (the memoirs) in their possession, finished, as they now appear, above twenty years.... a writer who wished to attack Mr. Clarendon was then refused a copy."[17]

Attention to the character of the "editor", then, was but one phase of a method of gaining the reader's belief-- a method which used indifferently mere query as to why travelers should not be credited; insistence upon the "truth" of a narrative; elaborate accounts of authors and editors of "memoirs." More important than such statements are the causes assigned for this quest for "truth," the attitude of fictionists toward the "imagination," and the results of the entire movement upon the development of narrative art.

As has been earlier remarked, behind all the 'lies' lay three assigned causes: the sinfulness of falsehood; the utility of the "true story;" and the pleasure af-

forded to a reader by belief in a fictionist's fidelity to fact. The first two of these motives are those most commonly announced-- we, indeed, might be anticipated during a period when the aim of edification dominated the theory of fiction. Over the wickedness of lying -romans can, on occasion, become tearful; the author of the Serpent of Horsham (1614) is sure of the fate of the deceiver; the Tombeau des Romans (1626), a treatise upon prose fiction, devotes much space to the "abyss" wherein truth is buried by writers of romans; in the same year Camus's Nouvelles points out the obligation by conscience to ""keep faithfully to the ground and body of the history;' and in 1641 (before Le Faux Hermite) Tristan l'Hermite avows: "truth will present itself so badly apparelled that one will be able to say that it is entirely naked." Defoe it was, however, who erected an almost sacrificial formula: "though he that preaches from the pulpit ought to be careful of his words,' runs the preface to the Storm (1704), "that nothing pass from him but with an especial sanction of truth; yet he that prints and publishes to all the world has a ten-fold obligation." Such a statement of a principle is not to be improved upon; and no such pregnant fiat decrees the second reason for truthfulness in fiction-- the utility of the "true story." Nevertheless, Saint-Réal's claim before Dom Carlos (1671) seems to have been approved long afterward by Lord Chesterfield (Letters to His Son, No. VI); the French author writes: "As one always judges that things of this sort (incestuous love) are culpable (criminellement de ces sortes des choses).... the author having found in divers places the details of their history, he has believed that he oughtto share them with the public, because they justify the memory of that Princess." And a snarl from the author of the English Hermit (1717) tosses the same ground: "Now it may without the least arrogance be affirmed that, though this surprising narrative be not so replete with vulgar stories as the former (Common Cursor) or so interspersed with a satirical vein as the latter (Gulliver's Travels)//.. yet it is certainly of more use to the public than either of them because every incident herein related is matter of fact."[19]

The third cause for the worship of truth --delight afforded to the reader by fidelity to fact-- is probably more significant than the other two. Its basis is in

aesthetic theory. Unfortunately, this cause is [illegible] during the period from Sidney to Richardson, and I, at least, am inclined to see in it the influence of the Italian novellieri. Certainly the one decided enunciation of the pleasure inherent in a truthful account of events is that of Sidney in 1580; and Sidney, as will be later developed, is such a determined opponent of the novellieri that he studies their methods in order to wrest them to his genuinely moral purpose. So that as it may, his words are unmistakable. Fénelon (Projet de Discours): "That which essentially distinguishes true histories from the false and the feigned, is the two marks, and, as it were, the two poles of good fiction-- time and place." In Discours, vol. II, pp.181 seq., he is yet clearer: "you who hear of an event arrived in neighboring places which you ordinarily frequent, will have, without doubt, more pleasure in hearing that which has come to pass near your abode, than if the event had happened in spots more distant."[25]

It might well seem that, with all this interest of fictionists in "lying truth", the imagination could never have been advocated. Indeed, it was seldom very vigorously defended. Yet, even aside from the notable efforts of Mlle. de Scudéry in its behalf --efforts best treated as a portion of her general theory of fiction (v. ch. V), half-hearted protests against the dominance of "truth" were made at times. Particularly was the MS. assailed.

In one sense such a MS. as the Don Quixote is supposed to be based upon might be called an oblique attack upon the use of chronicles and "memoirs." But there are more direct assaults of an early date. However, the first significant blow at the device seems to have been in the preface to Mlle. de Scudéry's Ibrahim (1641); she suggests that whoever doubts her tale may "imagine" that she has found a rare MS. in the Vatican! At intervals the discrediting of the MS. continued. In 1664 the preface to a whimsical little volume, Quevedo's Travels, tells of a MS. discovered in a "chandler's shop" at Milan; of this singular work there remains of the "persecuted author's" name only the letters, Don M. But, runs on the "editor's" logic, the book must be Quevedo's, because, if in his sleep the writer of the "famous Visions" wanders in Heaven, in his "sleep" likewise he could walk on the earth! By just so, the Voyage to the Moon (v. note 10, ch.III) is a dream confessed, and the Voyage to

the World of Cartesius laughs at"truth." Moreover, by 1730, Sandras and the Comtesse de ..... had publicly condemned as false such "memoirs" as were written by others.[21] It is, then, not altogether astonishing that in 1728 a staggering stroke was aimed at the ms.-- this, by Desfontaines, even as he was in the act of successfully employing the trick. Before Le Nouveau Gulliver the French imitator of Swift wrote: "The letter of Doctor Perruquier, which you will find at the end of chapter XIV, will contribute to give an air of probability to all the things in the work which have appeared extraordinary, and which are nevertheless recounted there as veritable.... because probability is that which one ought to have principally in view, when one undertakes to cover truth under figures." The results of Desfontaines's cut at the ms. are evident in the mocking or defiant prefaces of the Mémoires de Mme de Maravat (1731); of Crébillon's Tanaï et Néadarné (1734); of Les Mais (1738); of Lucid ou le dans les Sept Planettes (1750); of Les Voyages d'Eucrinédon (1758); etc.[22]

To attack the trick of the finding of a ms. and to uphold the rights of the imagination are very different matters. The scattering comments upon "probabilism"[23] might seem to be of importance here; but they are not. Only the indifference shown by certain fictionists as to whether they are believed, and the passing of this indifference into antagonism to the whole theory of "truth in fiction" merit consideration. One of the few examples of an expression of indifference is in Sorel's l'Orphile de Chrysante (1627), passing, be it noted, as a translation from the Greek: "Do not seek whether this book is ancient or modern, whether it has been translated from Greek into French, whether the histories are false or true, whether it is assuredly an Athenian who has made it, and what author is this Chrysante, of whom you have never heard."[24] One of the much rarer declarations of defiance is the admiration which the author of the Voyage to the World of Cartesius votes out to the bold "I lie" of Lucian's True History. Nevertheless, even here approval is followed by the statement that, since Lucian's method can not be used twice, the writer, "being a philosopher," will strive for "vraisemblance."[25]

Undoubtedly the hopeless struggle of the imagination against the desire for "truth" in fiction is one of the most important influences in the development of 17th and early 18th century prose narrative. Consideration of the effects of this struggle

upon the elements of narrative art increases the feeling of the importance of the conflict. The desire of the fictionist to be believed seriously affects, not only his constructive technique, but his conception of descriptive setting, style, and characterization. The last of these topics will here be wholly ignored; the first three may be barely touched upon.

It has already been made clear (p. 7) that the coherence of fictions was seriously damaged by the instructional aim of authors of voyages imaginaires, picaresque tales, and historical novels, who felt it as a part of their province to insert in their narratives diplomats and poems, descriptions of cities, and undigested blocks of history. It is self-evident that the wish to be believed aided in the same movement. This damage, however, was not the sole injury to which the desire for belief contributed its quota. The aim of depicting life brought about lack of unity in the novels of manners (p. 34). The theory of the Roman bourgeois has been quoted (p.41). Furetière, in his Roman bourgeois (1666), illustrates the relation between the depicting of life and the wish to be credited. He says (and he is by no means alone): "To avoid these inconveniences [premature revelation of improper secrets], I propounded several ways to myself: first, as to change the scene of the place, and to alter my true quality, and so disguise things.... but that appeared to be such an endless piece of work...."

Fortunately, good results of the wish to be believed somewhat offset the bad, at least as far as structural technique is concerned. The wish to maintain a clear point of view in regard to the narrated events is voiced; and consistency in detail became an obvious corollary to the effort for credence. Possibly, the native evolution of autobiographical methods of narration is bound up with the desire to be believed. In any event, this much is true: after 1675 endeavor to explain the possession of facts seemingly not within the range of the author's experience, grows more common than it had hitherto been. The hero of Jacques Lefèvre knows the fate of his parents who died before he could remember;" the reason is thus given: "I have received a memoir from a father Jesuit of Nixon." Marianne, too, gains her information concerning the murder of her father and mother from those who rode up "too late." Again, the Nouveau Gulliver is anxious, as has been seen, to escape responsibility for the tale of the

Terre de feu. Care for consistency in detail is a yet greater advance. One could scarcely better the composition of this mood in Hartlib's Macaria (1641). Early in the story the Scholar interrupts the Traveller: "That seemeth to me impossible. You travellers must take heed of two things principally in your relations; first, that you say nothing that is generally deemed impossible; secondly, that your relation hath no contradiction in it, or else all men will think that you make use of the travellers' privilege, to wit, to lie by authority." And from Hartlib to Defoe and Desfontaines runs the repetition of this advice. Two interesting comments upon it did not offset it in the slightest. Desfontaines, after having coolly analyzed many of Swift's tricks of measurement, etc., abandons competition with a subtle thrust: "As the fictions of this work (Le Nouveau Gulliver) are less singular and less daring, it ought to cost less effort to come to the goal of imposing belief." Prevost in the preface to Cleveland is more explicit: "Verisimilitude is not a necessary badge of truth."[27]

Care for consistency in detail might almost be said to embrace endeavor at accuracy in descriptive setting. But this feature of the will to be believed does not admit of elaboration here. Attention to geographical exactness is, it seems to me, a more direct result. Let one first think of the hero of Palmerin of England (1553), who, on leaving London, finds himself within a short time in an "enchanted valley," and then let one read before Pt. II of Robinson Crusoe Defoe's boast of the failure of "all the endeavors of curious people to reproach it with being a romance, to search it for errors in geography." What is the source of this vaunting? Obviously the pressure of the wish to be believed. Nor, be it noted, was the pride of Defoe, the claim of Desfontaines to "geographical exactitude," or the vivid description of Africa by Sandello de Lucca, a "new" trick of fictionists. These self-laudations may be traced back to the eyewitness and Great Unknown -- perhaps earlier.

If consistency in detail and accuracy of background may be declared to be intimately bound up with the wish to be believed, so likewise may differentiation of styles in prose fiction. Other factors, it is true, decidedly affected sentence structure and diction in prose narrative; yet nearly all the romances of chivalry, the picaresque tales, and the historical novels offer testimony to the value laid by the "truth-seekers" upon a "plain" and "direct" style. The author of the Sevaram-

ings indicate with solemnity the "unornamented" language of his fabricated M.
Benson's compilation (1677) apologizes thus for its "plainness of style": "the writer aimed at, as he confessed to me, nothing but the good of his countrymen, and.... as he had picked their pockets, he thought it needless to tickle their ears with the gilded straws of rhetorical expressions." The Memoirs of an English Officer (1757) is "not set forth by any fictitious stories, nor embellished with rhetorical flourishes; plain truth is certainly most becoming an old soldier." [28] Prevost writes before the Lettres de Millerine (1736): "If it (the wish to be truthful) does not communicate to me beauty of imagination, which is a gift of nature, and the graces of style, which are ordinarily the results of art, it will render me sincere in my recital, modest in my expressions...." Marianne's response to the query, 'What is style' turns into a famous question: "Shall I write as I write letters?"

Curiously enough, ornateness of style is as likely in the early 18th century to be connected with the desire for belief as is plainness of [illegible]. [illegible] this movement are best left for later discussion (ch. [illegible]). Only this much seems applicable here: that there can be no doubt that the Orientalists in fiction were fully alive to the value of Eastern simile and metaphor. [27] In a slight revolt from the Oriental school Montesquieu gives perhaps the clearest testimony to its theory of style; he says (preface to Lettres Persanes (1721): "I have relieved the reader, as much as I could, from the Asiatic style, and have exonerated him from the trouble of an infinite number of sublime and elevated expressions.... I have retrenched those long compliments...."

Our survey of "style" ended, we may once again examine an entire field of fictional theory-- that of the "effort to breed belief." Since 1679 there has grown up a vast and flourishing attempt which has overshadowed nearly every type of fiction. Its ramifications have been many-- assertion of veracity, accumulation of "authority," fabrication of MSS., insistence upon the sinfulness of lying, declaration of the utility of the "true story," proclamation that truth is the chief source of "delight." As a result of this upheaval, "imagination" has scarcely been allowed to see the day; and within the shadows results for fiction, both detrimental and advantageous, have emerged. The preface has become practically a first chapter, and

one which can not be justly set aside. Narrative structure has been ruined by the grafting upon it of information and descriptive ornaments; at times, fortunately, it has also been ruled by the pseudo laws of chronology. Feeble servants, called "geographical accuracy," and "appropriate style", have been quietly nourished.

[illegible] [illegible]

IV. The [illegible] of [illegible]

"Ainsi proscrivez les romans tant qu'il vous plaira, tonnez sur eux, lancez pour les exterminer tous les foudres de l'univers, on y reviendra toujours." So wrote Pierre-Daniel Huet, Sieur de Dufresnoy in his _Usage des Romans_ of 1734 (Vol.I, p.25). And for us his words have a curious importance. For, though they are intended to refer to all types of prose fiction, there is implied in them the reason why no definition of the term, 'prose romance,' can be satisfactory. Indeed, it was upon this very implication that was built the definition of romance offered in ch. 2: that form of prose fiction which can be attacked as unreal. Such a definition is very loose; but it expresses the most salient fact about romance from 1573-1713-- that, in order to meet the attacks of the moralists and the realists, it was forced to shift its content and form until no one definition of it is possible. Accordingly, for one who seeks to define romance more specifically than we have hitherto done, there is but one recourse-- to consider separately the various types of this protean species of fiction. For he can depend not at all upon the use of the terms 'history,' 'novel,' and 'romance' upon this or that title-page. Nor can he, as we shall immediately see, derive much of value from divers definitions of the general term, 'romance,' as given by lexicographers and by fictionists.

Not that these definitions are without interest. One can trace in them an effort to fix the meaning of the term. Sidney, it will be recalled, could write in the _Defense of Poesie_ that the 'poet' was allowed to "enter into another nature," creating and combining as he saw fit. But by the third decade of the seventeenth century Furetière stated in his unfortunate _Dictionnaire_ that the components of romance were "love, arms, and etiquette," and that its aim was "instruction." Richelet (1680) attempted a more binding definition; "Roman," he says, "is a romance which consists of some amorous adventure, written in prose, with wit, according to the rules of the epic poem, and this for the pleasure and the instruction of the reader." In France there seems to be no advance upon this essay until the _Dictionnaire Universelle_ of 1732: in its pages we learn of the romance that it is a "poem in prose," that it

contains 'lies of verisimilitude,' (romances vraisemblables), and that "few would consent to the reestablishment of the amorous disciplines of the romances." In 1751 Coyer-Mirmont was to use these words to point his distinction between virtue and passion in fiction. England was not behind France in its endeavors to define 'romance.' As early as 1656 Phillips in his little dictionary used the definition: "a feigned story about amorous adventures or warlike achievements expressed in fine language." And in 1684 a much-quoted and at present somewhat over-admired passage in the preface to Congreve's Incognita phrased itself thus: "Romances are generally composed of the constant loves and invincible courages of heroes, heroines, kings, and queens, mortals of the first rank, and so forth; where lofty language, miraculous contingencies, and impossible performances elevate and surprise the reader into a giddy delight, which leaves him flat upon the ground whenever he gives off and raises him to think how he has suffered himself to be gulled and transported, concerned and afflicted, at the several passages which he has read, viz., these knights' success to their damsels' misfortunes, and such like, when he is forced to be very well convinced that 'tis all a lie. Novels are of a more familiar nature; come near us and represent to us intrigues in practice, delight us with accidents and odd events, but not such as are wholly unusual or unpracticable, such which not being so distant from our belief bring also the pleasure nearer us. Romances give more of wonder, novels of delight." After such a definition of romance, to quote the poor scraps of the dictionaries of Kersey (1724) and of Bailey (1737) is unnecessary.

Obviously these general definitions, as well as others upon which we have not dwelled,[3] are suggestive. But in our quest for expressed theory, we are, as has already been said, inevitably driven back to the comments on the individual types of prose romance. Unfortunately, even this task is by no means so easy as it seems. Save for the theory of the heroico-historical type of romance, most of the material we have to consider lies implicit in the satirical romances or in the critico-realistic novels which depended for their success upon their re-presentation of the characteristics of this or that type of their brethren. Certainly this is legiti-

mute material for our patterns; yet it must be said with caution and with an eye upon the practice of whatever type of romance is being satirized. A satirist, I should be the first to admit, is less reliable a text affording material for future research than about the immediate success of his irony. Keeping these difficulties in mind, then, let us see what has been said about each form of prose romance, first by the authors, and then by critics or satirists; incidentally, we shall be revealing the theory of the satirical romance proper. The types of prose romance which we previously distinguished are, it will be remembered, the chivalric romance; the pastoral romance; the allegorical romance; the religious romance; the informational-educational romance; the satirical romance; and the heroico-historical romance. It may be added that, though we shall confine ourselves largely to France and England, the romance flourished and presented much the same assessed theory in Italy, Germany, and Spain.

The earliest type of prose romance, and that most bitterly assailed, was the chivalric in such examples as the *Amadis of Gaul*, and the *Palmerin of England*. But these we have already dismissed. Our interest lies from now onward with the efforts of this form to survive in such works as Cervantes's *Persiles and Sigismunda*,[4] the *Argenis*, Barclay, *Polexandre*, and *Cleopatre* and *Cleonte* of La Calprenède; the *Roman des Romans* of Du Verdier, and the *Clélie*, *Artamène*, and *Grand Cyrus* of Mlle de Scudéry[5]—all of these, save the *Roman Bourgeois*, as it noted, published before 1648. But if we ask what theory underlay these romances, we must turn for answer to the Spanish and French authors; one and all, the English writers are silent.

Cervantes, however, who is most interesting in his triple role of romancer, satirist, and outspoken theorist, expresses a definite plan for a "reordered" chivalric romance; through its glass we perceive the *Amadis* and the *Palmerin* limned darkly but not unjustly, and at the same time we can foresee the *Polexandre*. In *Don Quixote* he declares himself thus (Vol.II, pp.435-441): "Notwithstanding all the evil he had spoken of such books (the *Amadis*, etc.), yet did he find one good in them, to wit, the subject they offered to a good wit to work upon, and show itself in them; for

[illegible] ~~hindrances~~ describing of shipwrecks, tempests, encounters, and battles; delineating a valorous captain, with all the properties requisite in him; an action to frustrate the designs of his enemy, eloquence to persuade or dissuade his soldiers, ripeness in counsel, promptness in execution, to be short briefly in attributing to him the resulting of an enemy; describing now a lamentable and tragical success, then a joyful and unexpected event; there a most beautiful, learned, and discreet lady, here a valiant, courteous, and Christian knight, there an insupportable barbarous braggard, here a gentle, valorous, and wise prince; representing the goodness and loyalty of subjects, the magnificence and bounty of lords; sometimes he may show himself in astrologian, sometimes a musician, sometimes a statist, and sometimes, if he please, he may have occasion to show himself a necromancer; he may, if he will, demonstrate the subtlety of Ulysses, the piety of Aeneas, the valor of Achilles, the misfortune of Hector, the treachery of Sinon, the amity of Euryalus, the liberality of Alexander, the resolution of Caesar, the clemency and truth of Trajanus, the fidelity of Zopirus, the prudence of Cato; and finally all those parts that make a worthy and perfect; one whiles by placing them all in one subject; another by distributing them into many; and this being done, not set out in a glowing style and a witty fashion that approacheth as near as possible unto the truth, will questionless remain a work of many fair draughts, which being accomplished will represent such lively and correction, as shall fully attain to the best and aimed at in all writing, that is, as I have said, jointly to instruct and delight; for the [illegible] of these books gives to the author the means to show himself an epic, lyric, tragician, and comedian; with all other things else that profits and pleasant element of poetry and oratory include in themselves. For the epic may as well be written in prose as in verse." Present close, this rambling definition of the new chivalric romance yields as its components the familiar triple purpose of edification, amusement, and instruction, and a boundless license as to form and variety of content; this from a censure of romances just previous to this laudation, one might add "probability" as a desideratum-- nor it not for Cervantes's idea of that term embodied in his Ingis-

and entertainer. The proud writer sees no particular addition to Carnegie's remarks. He prefers it to Carnegie's, a continuation and summary of the Emilio cycle [1911], little his remarks so pompous. But Somerville is too interesting an exercise of consciousness of structure to be passed by. "A word more," he writes, "and not [illegible] to, because it is the last; not the conviction is inappreciable to me, because they [illegible] and attention, such activities, and such development. The irregularity [illegible] not [illegible] these important and perpetual carelessness. [illegible] Shorter. It occurs to the opinion of those who believe that [illegible] and [illegible], music, and manners; and it would love music less than it does, if it were not [illegible] loving in this folly, I leave you to judge if you ought to expect from so anything which should be either regular or finished." After such remarks, a reader ought to be quite prepared for what he will find in the [illegible] as [illegible] and, much enlarged, [illegible], as Lytherne [illegible], and as Le Demo Indifferent [illegible].

It has already been suggested that in our search for conscious theory we must often accept the material employed in a satire as being a re-presentation of the current theory concerning the type of person which is satirized. Evidently, in the case of the eulogistic romance, we must rely heavily upon such material; the authors' own words have not carried us far. [illegible], in most cases, is the principle underlying this satire? The answer is easy, I think: the satirists are actuated neither by a belief in Aristotelian rules, nor yet by an Aristotelian spirit of revolt against these rules. Rather, between them and it [illegible] like a literary-contested field--the meaning of the terms, 'probability' and 'time.' In character of the battles between romantic and realistic fiction in the seventeenth century one rarely ignore the importance of these two terms. Yet, though we must keep these terms always in mind, they are too vague to be employed as a basis for the revealing of one man's theory implicit in another man's satire. If for no other reason than convenience, we shall bring the attacks of both writers under two heads: those upon the 'literary' attitude of the romances; those upon their failure to present 'real life;' those upon their [illegible] of plot; and, finally, those upon their methods of characterization, their uses of setting, and their ideas of style. The last three of these topics will be treated

here only incidentally; they have full discussion in later chapters.

Amid the vituperation of the Amadis and its kin the cry of their evil moral effect was loudest raised and longest heard; and [illegible] of immoral situations is a part of the apparent theory of the chivalric romance before Sidney in England, Cervantes in Spain, and the immediate predecessors of d'Urfé in France. Gregory Smith may perhaps be right in interpreting one of Sidney's jibes as, in common with other Elizabethan assaults, "due less to a crazy dislike of what they chose to call their 'bold bawdry' than to the fact that they (the romances) were the work of 'amorous-lubbers' and 'wanton courts.'" Nevertheless, the assaults in Catholic Spain and in Orthodox France were distinctly similar to the English comments upon the moral nastiness and the "shameless lying" of the chivalric romance of the elder day. Upon this head so much has been already quoted (ch. 2) that here will be adduced only a speech in Don Quixote, which assails lack of probability more than moral looseness. "Verily, Master Curate," expounds the Canon in that immortal work, "I do find by experience, that those books which are instituted of chivalry and knighthood, are very prejudicial to well-governed commonwealths; and though (borne away by an idle and curious desire) I have read the beginning of almost as many as are imprinted, of that subject, yet could I never endure myself to finish and read any one of them through; for methinks that somewhat more or less, they all import one thing, and this hath no more than that, nor the other more than his fellow. And in mine opinion this kind of writing and invention falls within the compass of the fables called Milesiae, which are wandering and idle tales, whose only scope is delight, and not instruction; quite contrary to the project of those called Fabulae Apologae, which delight and instruct together. And though that the principal end of such books be recreation, yet can not I perceive how they can yield it, seeing they be forced with so many, and so proportionless untruths. For the delight that the mind conceiveth must proceed from the beauty, and conformity which it sees or contemplates in such things as the sight or imagination represents unto it; and all things that are deformed or discordant must produce the contrary effect. How then what beauty can there be, or what proportion between the parts and the whole, or the whole and the parts, in a book or fable wherein a youth

of sixteen years of age gives a blow to a giant as great as a house, and with that blow divides him in two as easily as if he were a goliet of sugar? and then they describe a battle, after that they have told us how there were at least a million of men on the adverse side, put if the knight of the book be against them, we must of forces, and whether we will or no, understand that the said knight obtained the victory through the invincible strength of his arm? What then shall we say of the facility wherewithal the inheritrix of a kingdom or empire falls between the arms of one of those errant and unknown knights? What understanding, if it be not altogether barren and barbarous, can delight itself, reading how a great tower full of knights doth pass through the sea as fast as a ship withna most prosperous wind? And that going to bed a man is in Lombardy, and the next morning finds himself in Prester John's country, among the Indians, or in some other region which never was discovered by Ptolomeus, nor seen by Marcus Polus? And if I should be answered that the inventors of such books do write them as fables; and therefore are not bound to any respect of circumstances, or observation of truth, I would reply that no untruth is so much the more pleasing, by how much the nearer it resembles a truth; and so much the more grateful, by how much the more it is doubtful and possible; for lying fables must be suited unto the reader's understanding, and so written, as that facilitating impossible things, leveling untrue things, and holding the mind in suspense, they may ravish a more delight, and entertain such manners as pleasure and wonder may stay by step walk together; all which things he that writes not likelihoods shall never be able to perform." (Vol. II, 319 seq.)

Following Cervantes came a host of assailants of the pre-Lutheran chivalric romance and its immorality. Many have been cited. Of others the most significant are Maréschal who in the preface to Chrysolite (1627) sneers at romances full of "deceit, lies, and impossibilities," and scorns "imaginations far from common sense, and still further from reason;" d'Urfé; Sulz. de Scudéry; Scarron; Furetière; Sorel; and Bougeant (1735). But before too hastily accepting all these thrusts as serious, one must remember the outburst of Monsieur Nicole of the Port-Royal in 1675: "A writer of novels or plays is a public poisoner, not of men's bodies, but of the souls

of the faithful; and he ought to look upon himself as guilty of numberless spiritual homicides-- whether, in fact, he has already caused them, or only may cause them by his pernicious writings." May it not be that part of the emphasis laid by the satirists upon the turpitude of the chivalric romance was due to a desire to protect their own works from such spiritual watch-dogs as Nicole?

Immorality of material could not, of course, be urged against the "reformed" chivalric romance of Rose or of Somerville; we have seen that (p.25) Somerville wrote, partly to oppose the Amadis. But the cry that the chivalric romance was "absurd," that it did not picture "life," was lifted against every example. The complaint is stressed in the passage just quoted from Don Quixote; and if we ask for detail upon the material which resulted from the theory of the chivalric romance, both early and late, we shall find it in Cervantes's satire. One warning here, however. Cervantes, for his own ends, emphasized the supernatural elements in the chivalric romance; and thus far he leads the student astray. In order truly to re-present the probable theory of the chivalric romance, he should have emphasized the institutions connected with knighthood-- its vows, its probations, its succouring of distressed damsels, its largesses, its punctilious cruelty of some ladies toward some knights, its combats and love-frenzies; he should have made much more than he does of omens, dreams, and prophecies; and he should have brought in giants smaller than wind-mills, dwarfs, hermits, and "savage men." Nor is this criticism carping. It becomes important when one realizes that Cervantes alone is responsible for such statements as that in the London Chaunticler (1598):

> "Heath: Come, shall we turn knight-errants? Dost thou know no enchanted castles, no golden ladies in distress, or imprisoned by some old giant usurer?
>
> Kristle: I have a design in my head that will outgo Don Quixote or Palmerin as far as they did the giants they overcame."

For giants in the Palmerin are few, and merely very large men. The carping becomes doubly important, when we consider how the chapbooks proceeded in their revisions to dilate upon those matters upon which Cervantes had dilated, and how more than one

modern critic has seemingly relied upon the chapbooks and upon Cervantes, than he wishes to discuss the Amadis or the Palmerin cycle. Far be it from one who like myself revels in Cervantes to censure him; I only wish to see justice done to volumes he himself-- loved or hated.

To the later satirists, it should be of interest for the critics of Cervantes to note, belong nearly all the strictures upon a third characteristic of the chivalric romance-- that formlessness so unluckily championed by Somerville. Cervantes does, indeed, make his canon (Don Quixote, Vol.II, p.239-244) declare that he has written one hundred pages of a fable "according to the rules of art;" and that worthy also says: "And as touching imitation (wherein consists the perfection of that which is written) I have not seen in any books of knighthood, an entire bulk of a fable, so proportioned in all the members thereof, as that the middle may answer the beginning, and the end the beginning and middle. But rather they have composed them of so many members, as it more probably seems, that the authors intended to frame chimeras or monsters, than to deliver proportionate figures, most harsh in their style, incredible in exploits, impudent in love-matters, fond in discourses, uncertain and senseless in voyages, and, finally, void of all discretion, art, and ingenious disposition." Yet this pleasant language is, it seems to me, offset by the opening of Volume II of Don Quixote, where Cervantes, speaking of the "thread of the relation," remarks: "we joy in this our so niggard and scant an age of all pastimes, not only the sweetness of his true history, but also of the other tales and digressions contained therein, which are in some respects more pleasing, artificial, and true than the very history itself." Of length of narration, furthermore, a distinct matter of attack for later critics, Cervantes says nothing.

The use of inserted and digressive narrative did arouse the satiric powers of Sorel and of others, notably of Bougeant in Prince Fan-feredin (1735). Awkwardly, therefore all the more clearly, Sorel aims one shaft in the Lysis (p.169): "Now here I think fit to discover some things, which haply have held the reader in suspense. I have purposely imitated those romances, which bring divers persons on the stage, without declaring whence they come, nor what they did before, but by little and little, so as to cause the greater admiration." Lysis himself, the Don Quixote of the

work, is later made to say (Fk.III, p.87): "all came very opportunely and was conformable to the adventures of all heroes in romances, who never go to any place, but they are entertained with some history." Sougeant is, as might be expected in the 18th century, more definite than Sorel: "As Arcadian writers do not conform to any of those rules of propriety, which Lucian, and many others, have laid down for history-writing, by reason of a singular privilege which we have of writing all that enters our mind, without concerning ourselves about what they term order, method, plan, precision, probability, arrangement; as we have likewise the dates of events at our own disposal, to advance or retard them as best pleases us."[14]

The cause of the lack of unity in the chivalric romances was attributed not only to the inserted histories, but to the mere length of these narratives. Sorel, it is true, makes but one pointed comment in relation to length; when Philaris directs Lysis to "describe with what affection he contemplated the relics of Cherite," he continues: "Now here thou must make use of amplification." (261) Scarron, however, and Furetiere,[17] are constant in their revilings. Sougeant (Jean-Feredin, pp.153-161) has at least one important hit in his account of the seven trades of Arcadia or the Land of Romance; the "threaders" who assemble "20 or 30 little nothings" to make their wares are probably the chivalric romancers.[18]

Such, then, was the 17th-18th century conception of the theory underlying the aim, the substance, and the structure of the chivalric romance. Every due reservation made, the theory came to this: an aim, at first one of mere amusement, then of more or less serious edification and instruction; a material very largely composed of wars, tournaments, and marvels,[19] but admitting much about formal "courting" and princely pomp, with all their embroiderings of set pieces of prose or (at times) poetry; a structure exceedingly, but not unboundedly incoherent.[20] Let us see what changes were instituted by its chief successors[21] of an early date, the pastoral and the allegorical romance, and why their theories were in turn abandoned.

Like the theory of the chivalric romance, that of the pastoral is to be gleaned mainly from the satirists-- though, again as in the former case, the writers of pastoral fiction left some interesting comment. This is notably true of d'Urfé.

Before, however, on can profitably consider the authors and satirists of the

pastoral school, it is necessary to destroy a rather common belief that every pastoral romance from the Diana onward dealt only with an idealized shepherd life and its inevitable "eclogues."[11] Certainly Boileau in the Discours prefixed to the Héros des Romans is maliciously unjust, and has been given undue weight when he declares of d'Urfé that the latter wrote, "wishing to turn to account a large number of verses, which he had composed for his mistresses."[23] Nor is the French dictator much fairer in another statement: "and to assemble in one body several amorous adventures which had befallen him." The truth is that even in such comparatively late pastoral romances as the Bergeries de Juliette (1585), and l'Astrée (1607) the functions of the enchanters and giants of chivalric romance are still, in the fashion of Montemayor (1542), in the hands of nymphs, "sage women," Druids, and satyrs; the Galatea (1584) even introduces a "Muse." In addition, inserted narratives in the pastoral romances are often of a chivalric tone, though no other pastoral which I know ever went to the length of Sidney's Arcadia in this matter. Nor in this work (1590), as we have noted before, we have no homogeneous pastoral, such as the work of Sannazaro (1504) or even of Montemayor; instead, we have a mixture, hard to separate, of the Greek novel, the chivalric romance, "purified," and the Spanish pastoral, freed from enchanted potions and sorceresses. A most characteristic passage from the Arcadia (p.233) is almost symbolical of the union of the chivalric and pastoral elements; it describes a tournament. "The first that ran was a brave knight, whose device was to come in all armed, with a nymph leading him. Against him came forth an Iberian, whose manner of entering was with bagpipes, instead of trumpets; a shepherd's boy before him for a page, and by him a dozen apparelled like shepherds for the fashion, though rich in stuff, who carried his lances, which though strong to give a handely blow indeed, yet so were they colored with hooks near the mouth, that they prettily represented sheephooks. His own furniture was dressed over with wool, so enriched with jewels artificially placed, that one would have thought it a marriage between the lowest and the highest. His impresa was a sheep marked with pitch, with these words, 'spotted to be known.' And because I may tell you out his conceit, though that were not done till the running of that time was ended, before the ladies' departure from the windows, among whom

there was one, they say, that was the star whereby his course was only directed, the shepherds attending upon Philisides went among them, and sang as acioque." [26]

To return to d'Urfé.[27] His assertions about his theory are fragmentary; nor do we need to repeat his desire to celebrate a French Arcadia, elaborate his wish to purify romance from "love" like that of the "the chevaliers of the Table Round," and remarks upon setting can not find place here. But upon character some of his views are closely connected with choice of material; and it is observable that his words echo a thought of the preface to Cervantes's Galatea. Cervantes's own phrases are best adapted to quotation: "Hence I have no fear that I shall be criticised because some philosophical reasons are interspersed with certain amorous arguments of shepherds, who rarely use in discourse beyond country affairs and this, too, with a congenial simplicity. Yet noting that many of the disguised shepherds are so only in attire, the objection is cleared." [27] Finally, if in regard to the use of shepherds as stalking-horses for concealed nobility we seek the collated for d'Urfé's view, we must turn to Baro, who became the "official" continuator of the Astrée after d'Urfé's death, for the expression of d'Urfé's effort to establish a relation between the structure of drama and that of romance. Baro writes in 1627: "in order that you may know the particular reason, I shall tell you that he formerly did me the honor of communicating to me that he wished to make of his entire work a pastoral tragicomedy [tragicomedie Pastorale], and that, as we French are accustomed to dispose them in five acts, each act composed of divers scenes, he wished in the same way to make five volumes composed of twelve books, in order that each volume might be taken as an act, and each book for a scene." [28]

Side by side with the pastoral fictions of d'Urfé and his predecessors flourished the allegorical romance— the third great type to be examined. It has many subdivisions; for it branches now into religious allegory, as in Imocio's Pantivolio and Urania (1667); now into political, as in Barclay's Argenis (1621); now into moral, as in Tigrone, Histoire du siècle futur (1655); now into philosophical, as in d'Autrenne's Macarise (1664); now into scientific, as in Bernalde de Verville's Chemophile (1587); now into the eminently personal, as in Gomaud's Endymion (1624) and Loucher's Roman des Oiseaux (1662).[29] Yet, though each of these forms of the allegorical

romance has assistant representatives in the Elizabethan fiction of Italy, France, and England --perhaps elsewhere--, the theory of one variety is substantially that of another.[36] Fortunately, too, the outline of this theory is succinctly put in an early allegorical romance, Lyly's Euphues. There we find (pp. 129-31) Nicopompus (Harvey), inveighing against the rebel Fuses (the Guises), who are besetting Alexander of Sicily (Henry III of France) for the hand of his daughter, Argenis (the French crown). Nicopompus proceeds to reveal his conception of the allegorical romance: "I will at length give way to their (his thoughts) impulsion, and with a free hand guide my pen; wherein the King hath erred, I will set down; and what anchor to save him, that now is near wrecked, the history of former ages doth offer. Then I will pull off the vizor from these seditious men, that the people may know them; what they merit both to hope and fear; and shew by what way they may retire themselves to that which is just, by what means the perverse may be ruined. Finally, I will not blind from the people the folly of their credulity; I will not, though thou shouldest persuade me, my Antenor." At this point Antenor objects that Nicopompus will become less of a favorite with Alexander than ever, that his book will not sway the traitors, and that it will lack readers, save perhaps "some men in the schools, who.... do only contemplate precepts of state in their books." Nicopompus speedily continues: "knowest thou not with what cunning, children, when they are sick, must be brought to endure their physic? As soon as they espy the physician with the cup, they loathe their health, which must be sought at that rate. But they which have charge of them, do either with sweet syrups take away the taste of the bitter liquor, or with gifts entice them to take that which should cure them; and deceiving them with a fine cup, not permit them to see or know what it is they must drink.... I will write a fable like a history. In it I will wrap my strange events; arms, marriages, blood, and contentments, I will blend together with success that could not be hoped for. The vanity which is grafted in men will make them delight to read me; and therefore they will study it the harder, because they shall not take me in their hands as a severe instructor. I will feed their minds with divers contemplations, as it were with a landscape. Then, with the imaginations of danger, I will stir up in them pity, fear, and

horror. At last, when they are perished, I will relieve them, and make fair weather of a storm. Thus I please I will reduce out of the land of Sicily; at my pleasure suffer to perish.... So, having won their liking to the potion, I will also add to it wholesome herbs. Virtues and vices I will frame, and the remedy of them shall suit to both. While they read, whether not concerned in it, they shall meet with themselves.... Perhaps they will be ashamed to play any longer that part upon the stage of the world, which they shall perceive in my table to have been duly set out for them."[32]

The Don Quixote of both the pastoral and the allegorical romance was the Lysis ou Berger Extravagant (1627)[33] of Charles Sorel, an industrious critic, bibliographer, satirist, hack-writer, and-- romancer.[34] From his very industry it is clear that in trying to deduce from the Lysis further theory for the pastoral and the allegorical romance, we must proceed more warily than in the case of Cervantes. Fortunately, Sorel's more open method of attack saves us from over-much reliance upon analysis of satirical practice.

To begin with, Sorel twice states an aim more directly critical than that of Cervantes; and in ch. III of the Lysis this aim is so phrased that we instantly note that "probability" has become a more debated question than in the days of Don Quixote. Since immoral actions are no part of the theory or practice of the pastoral and allegorical romances, Sorel lets that subject pass; he writes thus: "There is yet among us another kind of books against which I am resolved to speak. These books are called romances; and to speak properly, 'tis poetry in prose; there are a many fashions of them. The first that ever were seen in France treat only of knighthood, but they are such monsters as I shall not meddle with; they are already quelled, and I am confident there are not any in this company who esteem them. Instead of these enchantments, there are books which treat of things with much more likelihood." But Sorel's seemingly limited aim is not all of his clew for analysis; his satirical thrusts respond to cross-examination by revealing two direct canons for the criticism of romance-- the censuring of "repetition without order," and the reprobation of "insupportable want of judgment." And, however old and vague these phrases may sound,

their force becomes evident when Sorel assails the 'novel' love-making, and advocates attention to structural technique.

It would be impossible to summarize the details of the 'novel' love-making, as it is presented in the satire of the Lysis; one might as well summarize the Astrée. A few of the incidents will suffice to show the trend of Sorel's attitude and his grasp of the theory of love-making underlying the pastoral romance. Letters, both in prose and in verse, are such a formidable asset of the Astrée that in many editions one finds at the rear of each volume a list of Epistres, with careful references to their pagination. These Epistres, too, are printed in the text thus.

'Now Celadon took paper and wrote:

CELADON [illegible] TO ASTREE

I, humblest and most miserable..... "

Accordingly, Sorel mocks at these 'tender billets' (Lys), and when even the good shepherd-citizen, Lysis, declares: "Whether one should say, I writ her this ..... here— the line discontinues and a little lower there shall be ASTREE in a great character." Again, Lysis yearns to deliver a letter to his love, Charite, in some approved romantic fashion, and, naturally, very— climbs a ladder to her window, in order to leave the epistle upon the ledge. Even from the topmost round his reach falls short; Sorel pillories him thus: 'Methought he was like those capons' legs, whereof children do longthen or contract the claws as they please by pulling the sinews.' The unsavory fate which overtakes Lysis is best left buried in the yellowed pages. Sorel's anticipation of Boileau's attack upon the echo is equally characteristic of his satire, the echo, one may add, is almost as prominent in the pastorals as are letters. 'Lysis,' we read, 'came somewhat near the side of a fountain, when calling to mind that in the books he had read, the shepherds did interrupt the echo... 'Languishing wretch,' says he with a shrill voice, 'I have erewhile discovered my torment to all these deserts, hast thou heard it?' There was presently an echo that answered 'heard it.' 'What shall I do for to assuage my misery? tell me, seeing I have already related my chances.' 'Dance.' 'How is it that I must take my mistress, that my thirst may be quenched?' 'Hanged.' 'For such mishaps till me some remedy.' 'Die.' 'What kind of death shall I choose,

there being no succor if her goodness does not succor!' 'I cried.' 'The work of Cupid's bow!' 'No, no, I mean I believe to keep them,' cried Cosmie from behind a low wall."[37]

Sorel's explanation of the constructive errors of the romance is much more explicit than his condemnation of pastoral love-making. Then after that he strikes at five faults-- two general, three merely technical; and in the first of those groups-- the general faults-- he decries imitation of another's work and the whole theory of the allegorical fictions. As we easily realize from our study of the effort to force belief (ch.3), in the 17th century any attack upon initiative work is a grateful service to the derided cause of imagination. Sorel censures the folliness of the Astrée de Scudéry (1632) for its 'successes so common that they deserve not the relation," and points accusingly to the source of the entire narrative in the Daphnis episode of the Astrée (Tome .II, 1.1 seq.) of the Daphnis and Chloe he asserts: "I believe that book hath been the occasion that divers others have written books of shepherdry, and I assure you that they have imitated it so well, that they make all their shepherds bastards, not knowing neither father nor mother, no more than Daphnis and Chloe; and that when they were children, they had been carried away in their cradles by the overflowing of a river, and were afterwards found by somebody that brought them up. See if Baptista Guarini in his Faithful Shepherd be not such a fool as to make use of the same invention, and if a very many others do not the same still, as if it were of the essence of shepherdry to be lost in the infancy." Sorel's plea against the theory of allegory is not so well taken as is his cry for originality; like not a few moderns, he overlooks his victim's skill in composition. After discussing the key to Barclay's Argenis, Sorel's contemporaries, Garrison, vociferates: "Why should we love truth better under a veil than when she is naked -- one may boldly come and tell me I should not spend of the book as an ordinary romance, it being full of matter of state which prefer it before all other; do but read any book that treats of nothing but politic knowledge and you will find a numbers times as much in it.... Besides, any other discourse whatever is as much to the purpose as those you find in the Argenis."

The distinctly technical matters commented upon by Sorel are general unity of

composition, devices for lengthening or "amplifying" a romance, and the relation of the structure of fiction to that of the drama. In the first of these topics --unity of composition-- one might conclude from the Lysis a number of statements. The phrase, "lack of completeness," e.g., continually strikes the eye as one reads ch. iii. Yet often this censure implies nothing of value for the history of fictional criticism; for instance, Sorel complains of the well-regarded Theagenes and Chariclea. "He (the author) should have spoken with Theagenes's parents as well as those of Nausicles." "Lack of order," an equally common cry, here means something. The criticism of the Arcadia holds good for all time: "I find no more order in that than in the rest.... At the very beginning you have the complaints of the shepherds, Strephon and Climene, upon the departure of Uranie, without telling us who she was, nor whither she went. Now an author ought never to begin his book, but he should mention the persons principally concerned in the history, whose actions he is to relate above any of the rest; yet this man makes afterward no more mention of these two shepherds than if he had never named them; and though he crave the reader's pardon for sports before Basilius, yet that signifies nothing, since a man finds no period of their adventures, and that those verses wherein they speak of their loves, are so obscure, that they may be taken for the oracles of a sibyl."

Closely related to the problems of unity of structure are the 'amplificatory' devices opposed by Sorel. His attack upon digressive narrative in the chivalric romance (v.p.84) is equally applicable to the pastoral; indeed, in ch. iii of the Lysis, the digression de Sulictti, in particular, is not spared. In regard to informational digression, we have already noted the censuring of the Arcenis; and a similar criticism of a portion of the Theagenes has its point. "I know not to what purpose are introduced the history of the siege of Troy, and the fight between the Carthians and the Thebians, since he (Theagenes) took no part in such great transactions, and is but a poor captive in chains; whereas it might have been easy for the author to have employed him in some acts worthy of war and so have given us true satisfaction." As for verses, those ancient loves of the pastoral romance, Sorel seems to have no quarrel with them, when confined to that type of fiction. Very properly he would have them removed from the allegorical romance; of the Argenis he remarks: "The author

digress from the narrative to relate certain events... [illegible]. This is a disturbance of the order to [illegible] which are not very necessary. You will find also through all the book, certain verses which are thrust in to interrupt the history; and I know not why these are not reasonably brought in, except some hymns that are sung in the honor of the gods."

Certainly in regard to Sorel's ultimate reform unity of structure and "explicatory" devices the modern writer can have no objection; and when Sorel launched himself against the growing desire to relate the incidents of romance to time or order, he was, at this period, entirely in the wrong. For it was not the division of the Astrée into five tomes to represent acts which attracted his malice; it was adherence to the unities of time and place, or rather, though in a rather peculiar way, he fell foul. Concerning the digressions he quite [illegible] the controversy divides his actors into days and assigns the episodical couples out of the fields and thickets and never tells us whither they retire, nor how they live....All the adventures a man meets with by the [illegible] shepherdesses avoid, or seem one another; but to make amends for this, when they are all together in the same place, there's some one relates a story every day." More sharp is Sorel's strictures upon the Astrée: "All the histories which are related concern strange persons, and there is not one cut the same extraction to bring them all to accord; 'tis ever some Greek comes from thither." These very treatises, as we shall read later in the next chapter, are to become a most important factor in giving that unity to romance which Sorel himself was somewhat demanding.

Sorel's satire, we have seen, takes [illegible] to the [illegible] expression of the current theory of the universal romance; but from the examples Sorel notes this, how for the theory of the pastoral and allegorical fictions can be cited. Both of these types did exist; though not as strikingly [illegible] with. Let us, then, [illegible] in the case of the diverse narratives, gather together what we have gleaned of the theory of pastoral and allegorical romance-- whether from the direct expression of pastoral authors, or from the practice and comment of satirists.

In this, the pastoral romance was [illegible], and was indebted to the loose

tion of the pre-Addyson literary climate. In essence, although it was
[illegible] very old technique, it preferred French, Germanic, and Spanish romances
by Shepherds who were to be considered as exceptions, were in particular letter-
writing, conversation, satire, and humor. In fact, finally, it could extend to
a structure which was [illegible] to that of a "Tristan and"--a combo-
sition but partly to a full result [illegible] the interrelevance of the [illegible]
love-cycles, partly to the [illegible] it owed [illegible] partly to dependence
upon models. Nor was the theory of the allegorical romance wholly divorced from
this school.[43] Still, it was definitely instructional; and, as a result, though
frequently very skilful in [illegible] the pleasant manner, it was, because of miscel-
laneous digressions, less coherent. The characters, again, were not the all-absorbed
lovers who captured, original [illegible] from [illegible] romances like or one
of Arcadia; for the great writer, really, had chosen to [illegible] virtues and vices,
draped with the robes of statesmen and orators. [illegible] this [illegible], though without
his genius, his romances [illegible].

The [illegible] theory of the fourth and fifth types of romance --the satirical
and the [illegible]-- we [illegible] dismiss with mere mention of their
general positions; the fifth type --the religious-- need [illegible] only in one di-
rection. The satirical fictions [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], because of their
aim of accuracy, or, as we may call it, of 'truthing' in regard to 'literature.' They
used immoral situations. They accepted the idea of 'probability.' They had no pre-
tensions to unity of structure. The [illegible]-conventional romance, on the
other hand, was [illegible] more closely. Sometimes it allowed [illegible] probability; some-
times it [illegible] the rule. Always, however, it relied [illegible] upon variety
of content and [illegible] of unity-- [illegible], [illegible], and other romances are [illegible]-compli-
cated as [illegible] in [illegible] of [illegible] result from [illegible] of authors [illegible] on the au-
thors. Among the best examples, the Clitophon [illegible] owed itself to the Homeric
narrative and its epic style; but the Love Ethiopics, the Aethiopica, the Babylonica, the
Novels of Cyprus [illegible], and the Leucippe [illegible] seem to have been [illegible] noticed.

The rest of these six types of romance --the [illegible], the [illegible] versus

its most pointed exponent-- theories [illegible] its criterion. [illegible]
[illegible] its deep moral purpose, its [illegible] and realistic
tendencies, its fondness for low subjects. [illegible] 95
doctrine of verisimilitude, [illegible] as it was in fact by writers, [illegible]
moral. For [illegible] must refer directly to one feature of one theory or that
heroic-irrational type of romance to which we are now [illegible], [illegible]
Mrs Lennox. Nevertheless, mystical writers, [illegible] ("unsophisticated
love of nothing/.... disguise in the nothing that [illegible] is knowledgeless in the for-
eign that which is domestic, [illegible] and comic. [illegible] foreign?)
[illegible] theories that [illegible] romance religions, or
[illegible] these cosmologies have difficulty in finding [illegible], is an excess
which can not be approved. [illegible]

CHAPTER VII

THE THEORY OF [illegible]

Even when one has gathered all available material upon the erroneous theories of the six types of romance just discussed, these theories remain fragmentary. The case is otherwise with what Koerting appreciatively terms the flower of all the romance-forms, the heroico-historical fictions. Few of the other schools of romance can muster a great army of narratives distinct from one another in subject-matter; but in France alone, according to Lenglet's Bibliothèque (1734), the call of the heroico-historical romance for an assembling of its representatives would be answered by 10000 volumes. Nor need this army be greatly reduced because Lenglet was a satirist, or because of the general impression that all French romances of the seventeenth century were in a dozen volumes. There still remain something like 200 separate narratives.[1] Under these circumstances and as a result of the assaults of Cervantes and Sorel, it was but natural that a theory of the heroico-historical romance should arise early. The views expressed in the prefaces to Les Amours d'Ariane (1596)[2] and Les Amours d'Ossione (1597) may be passed up as unprofitable. But from 1626 occurs the confessions of Perrin, Baudoin, and in four volumes illustrate the power of a new theory of romance,[3] which was to be elaborated in the early 1640's by the three de la Calprenède and by Mlle. de Scudéry. From them it was to pass into England, Germany, and Italy-- perhaps into Scandinavia.[4]

Before undertaking, however, an analysis of the critical views of the two great French romancers, it will be not without value to mention the influences acting upon them and tending to produce similar or dissimilar work. La Calprenède's volumes refer[illegible] to d'Urfé, Perrin, and Desmarets; and the tenor of his life is a factor to be reckoned with. To d'Urfé La Calprenède is linked by a marked chastity of phrase, sentiment, and action; by the use of contemporary personages disguised under the robes of antiquity; by the parallel-subject-and-touch-and-go-interest love-motif;[5] by the employment of oracles to secure unity of place; and by an apparent tendency of the various "books" of his "parts" or "tomes" to approximate the function

of scenes in a drama. To Corneille he is allied by his scheme of historical verisimilitude. To Gomberville, finally, he is at least partly indebted for heroes who are "reformed" Amadises, and for the pre-Scudery, disguises, sieges, combats, and stereotyped descriptions which constitute the greater bulk of his subject-matter.[6] In regard to the influence of Calprenède's life upon his romances, it is sufficient here to suggest his Gascon blood, his prowess as a soldier, his success as a courtier, and his production of ten heroic dramas before 1642, the date of his first romance, the Cassandre.[7] Mlle. de Scudéry underwent somewhat analogous influences. She herself in her first romance, the Ibrahim (1641), cites as her models Heliodorus and d'Urfé; and it seems probable that from Gomberville she derived her numerous shipwrecks and her magnanimous pirates. Her life (or her brother's)[8] accounts for her emphasis upon love and emotion as opposed to that of Calprenède upom military achievement, for the set architectural descriptions, which she defends from first to last as the "adornments" of her romances, and, above all, for the conversations which render her volmes so much less coherent than Calprenede's.[9]

To return to expressed theory. In discussing Calprenède's views the first point to be noted is their constancy; the Cassandre of 1642 and the Faramond of 1658 stand virtually upon the same basis. Such constancy, too, renders easy the analysis of Calprenède's contributions to the theory of romance. Aside from a moral aim, buttressed by all the familiar arguments for "purity," and aside from some note upon character, setting, and style, these contributions were four. Calprenède has a clear idea of what one species of unity consists in; he knows how to employ the unities to secure this species; he examines the use of history in romance; and he considers the reconciliation of two conflicting doctrines-- coherence to historical truth vs. poetic justice.

Calprenède gives fullest utterance to his theory of unity in the preface to Pt. IV of Cléopâtre (1648).[10] Here he writes: "If in the following parts you take the trouble to consider the economy of the entire work, possibly you will find there more art and more plan (conduite) than you had expected. The subject, very ample and very spacious in itself, and aided by a trifle of inventive skill (invention), will furnish you a sufficiently large number of histories, in which all the considerable per-

sonages, of whom we treat, will enter with verisimilitude enough (assez de vraisemblance); and if in the entangling of several adventures considerably diverse, you will remark the structure (tissu) of the entire work, you will see that all the threads occupy their places in the fabric, and compose the web (piece) with a coherence which is neither easily-achieved nor common." Of course one must read Cléopatre to appreciate just how tangled Calprenède's web is; but a quotation from the preface to Cassandre will hint how completely mysterious the web can be: "you will not know her (the heroine) a great while, though she keep you very constant company, and will wonder to see her give her name to adventures in which she seems to have no part at all."

It is inevitable that we ask whether this claim of Calprenède's be true. The question, moreover, introduces us to his argument of the unity of place-- the second topic in our consideration of his theory. For it is by means of a strict adherence to one locale as the scene of all narrative which is not reverting, that Calprenède enables one to follow with ease the onward march of his vast romances. Unity of time may be one of his devices; it is not, however, directly claimed. On the other hand, unity of place is again and again boasted of. In the final page of Cassandre he writes: "The design to which I have hitherto known have tied myself not to wander from the banks of the Euphrates and the walls of Babylon hinders me from following my heroes in their voyages." Cléopatre says thus. "The design I have proposed to myself not to exceed the limits of my scene (the environs of Coloumbrin) suffers me not to wait on them in their several travels homeward, nor to give my readers any account of the glorious reign of Artaban over the Parthians." Vaumorière, continuing the Faramond, states: "not to depart from the scene (the shores of the Rhine near Cologne) which the former writer has wished to preserve to himself."[13]

Unity of place, then, secures for Calprenède's romances coherence in the onward movement between the reverting narratives, with which his volumes were drawn out from tome to tome; but our question concerning the truth of his claim of unity in extreme complexity remains unanswered. It is necessary to confront practice with theory. First, let Koerting be heard-- that most painstaking and sober-minded of all

the investigators of French romance; Ma says (Vol.., p. ...): "One can not read Calprenède's works without being filled with deep admiration at the skill with which episode is dovetailed to episode, at the happy harmony with which hundreds of single events unite into a great whole, at the well-calculated crescendo and decrescendo with which the main action and all the paralleling sub-actions move." My own comments upon the plot of Cassandre will serve to show the truth of these carefully-worded clauses. In the first place, the entire action of the romance depends in its minutest detail upon Alexander's overthrow of Darius. In the second place, the five parts of the narrative center, save for three episodes, about four pairs of lovers: Oroondates, prince of Scythia, and Statira, daughter to Darius; Artasement, son to Darius, and Berenice, sister to Oroondates; Lysimachus, a dependent of Alexander, and Parisatis, another daughter to Darius; Orontes, cousin to Oroondates, and Thalestris, queen of the Amazons.[14] In the third place, as has already been suggested, confusion of the forward movement of the romance is prevented by the use of retrospective narrative in nearly the whole of Pts. I, II, and IV, and in Pts. III and V with the exception of the fourth and fifth books in each of these parts. In the fourth place, not only are the main actions of the retrospective narrative again and again interlaced, but even the three episodes introduce persons in close relation to the main characters, and contain events influencing the outcome of the fortunes of the four pairs of lovers.[15] Surely, no other romance or novel before Tom Jones can approach the unity in complexity of the Cassandre; and Tom Jones is infinitely shorter. Is it needful to dilate upon the significance of the Calprenedian scheme of structure at a period when most of the realistic writers were openly scoffing at unity and coherence? This may be added, that the echoes of Calprenède's theory are heard in the prefaces of scores of writers who had not his genius for plot-structure. Where was the end of this influence?

It might seem that while Calprenède was boasting of coherence and skill he was employing unity of place as one of his chief devices to secure coherence, he could scarcely venture to claim fidelity to the historical subjects which he chose. Nevertheless, such a claim constitutes his third contribution to the theory of romance. In-

deed, he asserts that he is not a romancer, but an historian; and in his own defense develops [illegible] before Scott an elaborate account of the proper treatment of history in fiction. In Calprenède's earlier works, it is true, his attitude must be construed from his curious apologies for alterations in the facts of history. But in the preface to Faramond his words are bold: "In place of calling them (his works) romances like the Amadis and fictions resembling it, in which there is neither truth, verisimilitude, clearness, nor attention to chronology, one should regard them as histories embellished with somewhat of invention, and losing, perhaps, nothing of their beauty through these ornaments. In effect I can say truly that in the Cassandre and in the Cléopatre not only is there nothing contrary to truth (though there may be things beyond truth), but also that there is no passage in which one can convict me of lying, and that through all the cirumstance of the history, I can prove it as true when I please. I shall add nothing of my own to the matters of importance."

We have found Calprenède's assertions of the coherence of his romances remarkably exact. Can we say the same for his declaration of fidelity to history? This time the answer may be based not only upon Calprenède's practice --on this point everyone may be consulted-- but upon the romancer's own statements in regard to those alterations which he is willing to "prove." The reader whose knowledge of Persian history is vague will glide untroubled over the preface to Pt. I of Cassandre: "If all the adventures of Arsaces (Artaxerxes disguised) are not equal.... consider that my invention has not had an entire liberty, and that it has been crossed by Chronology, by the truth of the history.... and, in short, that I have been put to it.... to make Darius his son pass his time handsomely in Scythia, whilst his country was laid desolate." The same reader will admire Calprenède's moderation before Faramond (Pt. II), when he begs us not to be astounded at the size of the armies, because "Madagaise.... entered Italy, according to the greatest part of the historians, with four hundred thousand men, although in order to attach myself to the greater probability, I have followed the opinion of the smaller number who have given to him only two hundred thousand." But let us ask a little more about this son of Darius, who so unfilially abides in Scythia, while Alexander lays Persia in ruins; at the same time we shall hear of some other

"historical" personages. "You will have the patience," requests Calprenède, "to read these few lines I am obliged to add, that I may justify part of those things which I have written. I have been bound up in many passages of the conclusion by the truth of history, though perhaps I have altered it in some places where it is least known. If I make Statira and her sister live again contrary to the report of Plutarch, who says, she was killed by Roxana's cruelty, I have followed the opinion of many historians, and I make her pass the rest of her life in countries very remote from those where she spent her younger years, and under a different name from that by which she was known to Plutarch. I well might give Darius a son without contradicting the historians that write of Alexander, who only mention his (Darius's) daughters; I make him dead in the opinion of the world before Alexander entered upon his father's territories, he comes thither no more until after his death, and therefore those authors might well have been ignorant of Artaxerxes, his life, he having passed it in very far countries, and under another name, after he had lost it in the general belief. I with the same license might make him to be that great Artaxerxes who founded the empire of the Parthians; And Historians, not having given him any certain birth, have afforded me the liberty to make him be born of Darius. I should undoubtedly have made him recover his father's empire, if I could have done it without falsifying truths which are known to all the world, and which have not left me a free dispensing of my adventures." Surely, such remarks as these commit Calprenède to a double-dealing with history not unlike Scott's; the extreme position to which he was pushed in Faramond, his last production, is even more suggestive of the views of Scott. Faramond, explains Calprenède, is the subject of his third romance, not merely because he can find no world-conqueror to place beside Alexander of the Assemblere or Caesar of the Cléopatre, but because with Faramond the author's imagination will be more free. "I do not agree," he says, "that the supposed obscurity of this (epoch) is so disadvantageous to me as is imagined. It leaves for my inventive skill (invention) much more liberty than I had in the case of truths known to all the world, and I can give qualities to my heroes, who will shine in all their beauty without being eclipsed by a greater luminary, such as that of the Caesars and Alexanders, who lay claim to

all the earth, without leaving any place in consideration of the heroes whom I could oppose to them." [16]

Thus much for Calprenède's conception of the relation of his plots to historical fact.[17] His views are not unmodern. But modern ideas part company with his when he discusses the depiction of historical characters and the use of historical background. Here these matters are merely touched upon, in order to fill out the sketch of his general theory. His most salient words are those before t. III of Cassandre: "I take a little liberty in the description of some particular actions, and that instead of following the manner of writing used by Plutarch, Quintus Curtius, Justin, and other authors, from whom I have drawn the foundation of the history, I make my heroes march unto the fight in a way somewhat nearer to that of Homer, Virgil, Tasso, and other writers of that nature, who have beautified the truth with some ornaments, rather more pleasing, than confined to a strict and regular likelihood.... So much rather seek the reputation of Iroquoites and Irsaces than that of the Medes, Persians, and Macedonians in general, but yet without making them remarkable by impossible actions or extravagant inventions.... I drew the siege of Babylon by that of Aravelines. This slip of my pen is perchance against modesty, but it is to be pardoned in my nation, and in the desire I have of declaring my trade, to find excuse for many faults."

It must be obvious to everyone that out of Calprenède's claim to be an "historian" would arise need for still other apologies than those concerning alterations of historical truth. As a matter of fact, Calprenède clashed with the theory of "poetic justice"— that seductive principle of fiction which metes rewards to the virtuous and punishment to the unworthy. And when one considers how powerful poetic justice has always been in fiction, this phase of Calprenède's theory looms large in potentiality. It is the last phase which we shall note here. At the close of Cassandre we observe: "I should have changed something in the destiny of Roxane and Cassander, if I might have been permitted, and if I had pardoned Roxane in consideration of her sex. I should have killed Cassander to shew the punishment of vice, as well as the recompense of virtue; but the rest of his life was too well-known by his crimes and by his ruling in Greece. I have been truer in those of Perdiccas and his brother;

'tis certain they were slain within a while after Alexander's death, by a sedition among their forces, and there is so little spoken of the particulars of their death, that I believed I might lawfully frame it to my history." Surely this comment is a step, though perhaps an unwilling one, toward untrammeled realism in the moral world.

As surely, too, Calprenède's general theory of romance is a seven-league stride beyond that of Scudéry, d'Urfé, or Barclay. In lieu of obscurity incoherence or careless unity broken by extraneous material of every sort we have well-knit, though highly complex plot; in lieu of geography in vague and history de novo we have well-authenticated and possible actions of historical personages in historically-charted lands; in lieu of allegorical and poetic justice we have destinies not undetermined by stern and "unjust" fate. Still, if the heroico-historical romance is to be fully comprehended in its peculiar intricacies and makeshifts, we must turn from Calprenède to Madeleine de Scudéry. For her theories were even more potent than Calprenède's; and they are not scattered here and there, as are his, but are thrice detailed at length. In the preface to Ibrahim (1641) and twice in Clélie is to be found the only consistent and elaborated theory of fiction before 1710.[18] So elaborate, in truth, is this theory that many varieties of treatment of it are possible. For convenience let us present here Mlle. de Scudéry's moral aim; her insistence upon the use of a plan; and her definition of vraisemblance. Character, setting, and style are as usual left for later chapters.

Mlle. de Scudéry's defense of the moral aim in fiction demands at least some amplification-- despite our full discussion of the importance of the edifying purpose in the seventeenth century (v. ch. 2).[17] Partly this is because she takes upon herself the burden of a reply to the ever-recurring attacks of the moralists and the realists; partly it is due to the use made by her of a novel argument. We may, of course, pass over the familiar fact that in an age which saw the first great chronique scandaleuse,[20] Mlle. de Scudéry stood for decency of theme and treatment, for modesty in incident and language. Nor need we do more than enumerate the stock defenses of fiction-- morality inspired in readers of romance in the same way that mirrors gently induce ladies to remedy imperfections of feature; reading supplying the

places of experience and travel; gentle notion rejecting the monstrous outcome of historical events.[21] But the curious and sharp parrying of the satirical thrust, "not true to love and life," seems wholly new; nor does it again reappear until Mrs. Carter's Ephigus (1730) and Fernandin de St. Pierre's Paul and Virginie. In M. Vill of Clélie Herminius undertakes to reply to some "old doctors" and "Roman matrons", so "afraid of love that they forbid even their children to read a fable of this manner," as well as to a "great number of people who would speak of it as a mere bagatelle and as a useless diversion." "In all the roads where I have travelled," he declares, "I have found love. But I have found it more pure, more moral, and more criminal among people who have no politesse and who are entirely ignorant of the beauties of gallantry (de la belle galanterie), than among those civilized people.... This love, then (ordinary, sensual affection), would not be crushed, by a fiction of which I approve. On the contrary, modesty would be always joined with love; and one would never see criminal loves which were not unfortunate."[22]

Just approved by Mlle. de Scudéry is that species of the art of edification which we have called the religious; indeed, it is this purpose of instilling reverence which one notes as differentiating the edifying aims of Desfrenade and Mlle. de Scudéry. It is important because it differentiates also the content of their romances. Of course the religious aim was not new. Gomberville, it will be remembered, had strewn his Polexandre and his Cythère with moralistic anachronisms, and Desfrenade had said he would be faithful in presenting ancient ceremonies. But anachronisms Mlle. de Scudéry wished to avoid; and she is much more explicit than Desfrenade. With these words Herminius is made to uphold Mlle. de Scudéry's loving detail concerning ancient temples and sacrifices: "But he (the reader) would likewise be enabled to learn reverence for the Gods, through the example that one could give in the person of the heroes who one would propose for models. And no matter what nation or what religion he was, he could draw profit therefrom. Because, when I see a Persian who reveres the Gods of his country, he does not fail to give me good example, although I am a Roman, and to teach me that I ought to revere those of my country."[23]

Mlle. Scudéry, however, does not merely indicate the moral and religious val-

of fiction. Upon the necessity of a unity of composition she is as insistent as Calprenède— though the pressure of other of her theories brings about far less unity of structure. She prefers to furnish best voices for general view: "Every art hath its certain rules, which by infallible means lead to the ends proposed; one provided that an architect takes his measures right, he is assured of the beauty of his building. Believe not for all this, reader, that I will conclude from thence my work is complete, because I have followed the rules which rehearse it so." The rules which she has followed are then expounded: "Whereas we can not be knowing but of that which others do teach us.... I have believed that for the laying of the ground plot of this work, we are to consult with the Grecians, who have been our first masters, pursue the course which they have held, and labor in imitating them to arrive at the same end, which those great men propounded to themselves. I have seen in those famous romances of antiquity, that in imitation of the epic poem there is a principal action whereunto all the rest, which reign over all the work, are fastened, and which makes them that they are not employed, but for the conducting of it to its perfection. The action in Homer's Iliad is the destruction of Troy.... and to pass from the poem to the romance, which is my principal object, in Heliodorus the marriage of Theagenes and Chariclea." Seemingly, Mlle. de Scudéry is thus far in accord with Calprenède. But a slight divergence in theory is presently stated: "It is not because the episodes in the one, and the several histories in the other, are not rather beauties than defects; but it is always necessary, that the address of him which employs them, should hold them in some sort to this principal action, to the end, that by this ingenious concatenation, all the parts of them should make but one body, and that nothing may be seen in them which is loose and unprofitable." And the extent of actual divergence, be it added, becomes perfectly evident when we turn to the more minute details of Mlle. de Scudéry's theory, as set forth in Clélie, Pt. VIII. By the side of these the great Frenchwoman's devices to secure coherence are seen to be ineffective; her claim of unity of time, e.g.; her declaration for an opening in medias res; her intention of ending with a marriage which "will coalition" all the events leading up to it.[24] The truth is that the romances of Mlle. de Scudéry are remarkably

incoherent; and that her practice, loose in _Ibrahim_ (1641), looser in _Artamène_ (1649), most loose in _Clélie_ (1654), is altogether dependent upon views which were not those of Calprenède and his followers.[1]

With this divergence in mind, let us turn the pages of _Clélie_, t. VIII. During a lull of events, a company of men and women, Greeks, Romans, and Africans are talking; the topic is _de la manière d'inventer une fable_. Herillone is naming the faculties and qualities requisite to an historian. First come "an understanding of wide compass (_un esprit d'une grande étendue_).... imagination.... judgment.... a never-failing memory.... universal knowledge of the world." Then follow acquaintence with "the interests of princes and the humour of nations.... political life.... the military art.... the depiction of battles.... representation of the wars of the subject.... intrigues, deceits, negotiations.... the diverse passions of princes." Last of all is noted the ability "to say neither too much nor too little, and to say nothing that will not instruct or divert." Surely a sufficient catalogue of requisites for many professions! Yet Herillone has more exalted ideals for the romancer. She continues: "in order to compose a perfect fiction, ornamented with all which can make it agreeable and useful, I maintain that it is necessary to have, not only all that I have spoken of,... but still other accomplishments (connaissances) more extended and more particular.... to know perfectly the polite usage of the world (_le bel usage du monde_),.the rules of good breeding, and those of conversation; the art of ingenious badinage; that of making innocent satires;" Nor can the romancer neglect, she closes: "the art of making verses, that of writing letters, that of giving orations.... no, not one of all the fine arts, of which one can sometimes find, by the way, occasion of speaking." Here Herillone to have added (as does her inventor elsewhere) the ability to draw word-portraits of one's contemporaries,[2] and the faculty of describing at length temples and palaces, she would have fully expressed Mlle. de Scudéry's ruinous idea of the "ornaments" proper to the heroico-historical romance. Certainly Calprenède's services to the divinities of unity and coherence were not so efficient as the sacrifices of Mlle. de Scudéry in the temple of lawless digression.

Distinct moral and religious aim in composition and distinct belief in "delight-

ful" digressions from the main theme are, then, two great parts of Mlle. de Scudéry's theory of romance. The third part we have called the need to accept vraisemblance--a term translated by English contemporaries of Mlle. as "true resemblance", but by most modern critics as "verisimilitude." Neither gives concept at all the meaning of the word for Mlle. de Scudéry.

In so doing her meaning can only be with her own definition; and this is easy enough, for Mlle. de Scudéry explains her conception of the term at least three times--in Clélie very broadly, and in the preface to Ibrahim and especial attention to the use of history in fiction. It is Clélie herself who in t. III of the famous romance (p. 427 seq.) says: "There are some verisimilar matters which are so little agreeable and so distant from all vraisemblance, and there are some invented matters which are so diverting and so vraisemblables that one may say that sometimes the falsehood is more agreeable than the truth, and that it more closely resembles (issu ressemblant) truth than the truth itself." It is Anacreon who in t. VIII throws more light upon the question: "because when you wish to compose a fiction, you have the design of being believed; and the true art of falsehood (le vé itable art du mensonge) is to resemble closely the truth."[27]

Are we, now, to gather from these and other direct definitions of Mlle. de Scudéry, we might well feel that by vraisemblance she means "probability." We might even be warranted in ascribing to Mlle. de Scudéry enmity toward most phases of the powerful contemporary "effort to secure belief" (v. ch. III), and a daring adherence to the Aristotelian preference for the "probable impossibility" over the "improbable possibility." Again, however, we should be going astray. For "probability" is no more accurate translation of vraisemblance, as used by Mlle. and her followers, than is "true resemblance" or "verisimilitude." Vraisemblance, we too often forget, varies its meaning from age to age. For Achilles Tatius, in the 3rd or 4th century, it consisted in such matters as saving his heroine Leucippe from enemies, not by providing her with a magic ointment or an Achillean skin, but by furnishing her with a false statement which, when ripped open, discharged animals' entrails. Again in comfortable chairs, far from pirates or barbarisms, we smile and murmur, "How improba-

ble! "Improbable" is also the cry with which Bussy-Rabutin greeted the Princesse de Clèves-- a novel in which vraisemblance seems to mean fidelity to the psychology of emotion as an unhappy woman understood that phrase, and as Bussy did not. "Improbable," again, is the sneer with which some modern critics dismiss Ivanhoe-- wherein vraisemblance seems to mean truth to the spirit of chivalry as Scott interpreted that quality, and as Mark Twain, e.g., did not. And "improbable," I venture to suggest, is the calm remark with which some healthy future age will pass by the dust-covered volumes of both our local-color and our anatomico-psychologico enthusiasts.... But what was vraisemblance for Mlle. de Scudéry, if the term is not to be summed up in either "true resemblance," "verisimilitude," or "probability?" Perhaps vraisemblance may be best understood under the metaphor of a lofty vault resting upon three main pillars. If I am seriously told that such vaults are unknown to architecture, I may answer that Mlle. de Scudéry's palaces are not well-known to architecture, and that her theory of vraisemblance is eyed askance by regular literary brick-layers.[27]

The three pillars of Scudérian vraisemblance, at least before the appearance of Almahide (1660) are these: propriety, or the pursuit of the canons of art, as revealed by the practice of Homer, Heliodorus, and d'Urfé; aesthetic delight; and the proper use of history is fiction. On propriety, however, nothing can well be said at this point; some of its aspects have been treated in the discussion of the moral and religious aims of heroico-historical romance, and others are so bound up with theories of character, setting, and style that the reader must yet again be content to wait for the special examination of those topics. On the other hand, the discussion of the catch-word, "aesthetic delight," is germane to the present inquiry. Let us again play eaves-dropper upon that conversation in Clélie upon De la manière d'inventer les fables. From it can be discovered why fictions which are intended to be aesthetically pleasing must possess vraisemblance.

Plotine, merely to draw out Anacreon, is advocating a theory of romance, never, perhaps, realized in fiction save in the conte de fée. "As for me," she declares, "if I should compose a fiction, it seems to me that I should make things more perfect, indeed, than they are. In fact, all the women should be admirably beautiful; the

men should be as valiant as Hector, that I myself should kill at least a hundred men in each battle; I should build palaces of precious stones; I should make prodigies happen at every moment; and without causing myself with having judgment, I should let my imagination act to please it. Thus, in accepting only for surprising events, without considering whether they were well or ill founded, I should necessarily produce things very extraordinary, as continual shipwrecks; conflagrations of cities; and a thousand other beautiful things, which give occasion for (pour faire) charming actions (plaintes) and delightful descriptions." Aotino, having finished, Anacreon comments: "you would make one of the worst fictions that one could ever invent." If any one further ask why, Clélie herself had the answer ready: "things which have close relation to the truth, and which appear to be possible (peuvoir arriver), affect one much more than those which one can neither believe nor fear." And Clélie, one notes, is merely reading a more vigorous statement made by Le Moyne thirteen years before (preface to Eromène): "this kind of reading disgusts instead of entertaining."[29]

When all the band of critics in Clélie are agreed that the impossible can not furnish true aesthetic satisfaction, further accord is made as to the exact connection of the vraisemblable, the real, and the delightful. Valérie suggests to Anacreon the method of the realists: "one will speak of, it seems to me, only very ordinary things (choses assez communes)." Finally Anacreon plunges into the thick of a dispute agitated not so long since by Henry James and Stevenson. "But Valérie," he begins, you touch a matter very delicate. Because, in fine, it not wishing to suffer the incredible and the impossible, one does not mean to apply only the low and the common; there is a third way to take, which is the most agreeable of all, and the most reasonable. Marvellous things, for example fortuitous, are necessary, provided that they do not happen too often, and that they produce beautiful effects; and it is only the bizarre and the impossible, which it is absolutely necessary. Because the way to be led to believe nothing (pyrrhé), is this: when one has once found a thing which one can not believe.... That it is almost equally necessary to remove oneself from things impossible and from things too and common; and to search ways of inventing that which shall be at the same time marvellous and natural." Where, we cavesa

[illegible] may now every, is to be found this factor of the marvellous and the natural. The answer is rather not in [illegible] than in [illegible]. When "falsehood and truth are confounded by a fantastic load" is a web which "at last must ... to disentangle, this web, announces Mlle. [illegible], can only be the heroic-historical romance. "To give vraisemblance to things, I have made the foundations of my work historical, my principal personages such as are copied out in the true history for illustrious persons."

Mlle. de Scudéry, then, separates from Calprenède in her theory of the use of history in fiction quite as emphatically as she separates in her theory of coherence. For Mlle. it is to be sure only in theory. History is no use, fashioning in its iron-bound way the means, fiction; for her history is a means to an end-- that end vraisemblance in fiction. As a result of these differing views, also, Mlle. de Scudéry's detailed laws on the weaving of history into fiction are not those expressed by Calprenède. This is most plainly seen in her only utterance on the broadest of all points-- the changes made in her "authorities." Her careless assumption of the privileges for which Calprenède cautiously apologizes might be read into her careless fling before Artamène anent a "ms. found in the Vatican," which the scrupulous reader may, if he will, 'trounce!' But in the same preface she continues in unmistakable terms: "You can see that, although a fiction should not be a history and that it suffices for him who composes it to attach himself to the probable vraisemblable without always attaching himself to the true, nevertheless in the things that I have contrived, I am not so far distant from all these authors as they are, one from the other." Following this comes her frank confession. Since couples and Cassiopes differ in their accounts of the career of Cyrus the Great, one may not be allowed liberty? "Thus I have followed now one, now the other, according to whether they have been more or less easy to be like. Not doubting, following their example, I have said that which neither the one nor the other has said, because, after all, it is a fiction which I write and not a history."

Mlle. de Scudéry's statement about the use or misuse of historical fact does not in the least subvert her account of the proper use of History in romance-- a topic, it will be remembered, which we chose as the third pillar for vraisemblance. She

investigates the role of the spectacular in fiction. She considers what epoch is best suited to the romancer's use. She develops adroitly a plea for the omission of awkward facts in past ages. Finally, in connection with this plea, she treats of the relation of emotion to the securing of vraisemblance.

A reader of Clélie is rather dumfounded, when he recalls from the preface to Ibrahim Mlle. de Scudéry's statement that she does not overuse the spectacular, and then, in turning the pages of Clélie, finds in the first hundred an earthquake, an abduction, an ambush, and two shipwrecks.[30] Nevertheless, if he will compare Clélie with German's Histoire Africaine or Gomberville's Polexandre, he will feel that Mlle. de Scudéry's theory is to some extent her practice. And in any event the theory had some startling influence upon fiction after 1670. Of shipwrecks, in particular, the preface to Ibrahim has this to say: "the ordinary course of the sun seems more marvelous to me than the strange and deadly rays of comets; for which reason it is also that I have not caused so many shipwrecks, as there are in some ancient romances; and to speak seriously, in Poetics might say [illegible] of these authors,

That with their words they bind,
Or loose, at will, the blowing of the wind."

Nor is Mlle. retracting these words, when she adds: "Nevertheless, I pretend not hereby to banish shipwrecks from romances; I approve of them in the works of others, and make use of them in mine; I know likewise that the sea is the scene most proper to make great changes in, and that some have called it the theatre of inconstancy." Attention to vraisemblance, too, underlies the following passage: "The same design is the cause also, that my hero is not oppressed with such a prodigious quantity of accidents, as arrive unto some others.... It would be better in my opinion to separate the adventures, to form divers histories of them, and to make persons acting, thereby to appear both fertile and judicious together."[31]

When Mlle. de Scudéry passes from choice of material to the selection of a proper historical field for her heroes, she anticipates that phase of the calprenadian theory, which he did not voice until Pharamond (v. p. 61); moreover, again Mlle. refers her decision to "aesthetic delight" and to vraisemblance. In Clélie, Pt. VIII, Clotine inquires why one may not write about a non-existent country. Because,

replies Amereon, "if one named only persons and places which one had never heard spoken of, the reader would have less curiosity; and the imagination, finding everything new, would be disposed to doubt of all." Yet, in some on, the age chosen should not be too well-known. Rather, the ideal is this: that "one choose a century which is not so remote that one does not know somewhat of its detail (de particulière), nor so near that one knows too much of everything which there occurred." Then "there is room to make events indeed more beautiful than if one only invented (que si on inventait)."[92]

No one, perhaps, will quarrel with Mlle. de Scudéry's theory upon the selection of historical material out of historical epoch. But the form of her plea for the evasion of fact has brought upon her the sneers of all the realists, and her plea has, in consequence, been misinterpreted as being a concession to the perverted taste of herself and her period. This charge is, I must admit, partially true. Yet her theory, whatever may have been her practice, involves another matter than Mlle.'s unfortunate attempt to garb her contemporaries in Persian, Greek, and Roman costumes. She evades the facts of history because she wishes to subordinate both plot and character to emotional effect. I pause to remind the reader that love and emotion have had different meanings for different epochs-- just as has "probability."

The importance of "emotion" in the theories of Mlle. de Scudéry might be questioned, were it not that she herself has traced certain changes in her historical material to that all-powerful agent, which the world calls love. The immediate reason why a group of characters in Clélie debated the to ic, De la manière d'inventer une fable, was that just before the discussion one of the party had related the legend --or 'history'-- of Hesiod and Clymène. Amereon begins: "It is .... ingenious. For not only do I find it more beautiful than the truth, but also more vraisemblable. And it is as Amereon explains this perplexing statement that we see the relation between emotion and vraisemblance in the Scudérian romances. Historians, Amereon informs us, narrate only the following facts; Hesiod's prowess in poetry; his murder by Antisanes and Lanictor, the brothers of Clymène, because of his being her confident in an amour with an "unknown"; the transportation of the corpse by dolphins to

to a beach near which devotees of Neptune are chanting hymns in the god's temple; finally, the onslaught of Hesiod's dog upon the murderers, and their destruction by the infuriated worshippers. Next, Anacreon attributes certain of the changes in the recently-related version of the tale to desire for vraisemblance. Of those first mentioned most are plainly due to an effort at greater probability; but one even of these alterations is partly due to a wish for emotional effect. The attack by the dog is omitted; in place of such a mode of revelation Climène in an access of anguish accuses her brothers, and their faces and posture at once betray them. As for the most startling change in the legend --the introduction of the Prince of Locris as the patron of the brothers and the lover of Climène in rivalry with Hesiod himself-- this is directly attributed to the value of emotion in winning readers and in aiding vraisemblance: "When one wishes to bring about extraordinary events, it is without doubt a much better expedient (bien plus beau) to introduce love than any other cause."

We have discussed much in the opinions of Mlle. de Scudéry which is constantly ignored by her critics. As our final topic we approach the one phase of her theory which has been widely exploited ever since Boileau's ungenerous Héros des Romans. Why does Mlle. de Scudéry twist her doctrine of vraisemblance so that her Ibrahim, her Cyrus, and her Horace are alike absurdly gallant gentlemen of the court of Louis le Grand? Partly, of course, this twist is due to an illegitimate extension of her idea of the importance of emotion, a matter we have barely left. Partly, too, it is due to that rage for "portraiture" to which we shall turn later on (ch. IV). But partly, perhaps mainly, it is due --as Mlle. herself admitted too late-- to a fatal wish to please the seventeenth century. The views of Mlle. de Scudéry upon what we call local color are, I still maintain, admirably accurate up to a certain point; beyond that----- . For instance, in the preface to Ibrahim we read: "I have observed the manners, customs, religions, and inclinations of people.... know that I have put them (Italian names) in their proper pronunciation.... if you see some Turkish words, as Alla, Stamboli, the Vgira.... I have done it of purpose.... if any one remarks the name of satrap in this romance, let him not imagine that my ignorance hath confounded the ancient and the new Persia; I have an example thereof in Vignere...

I have learned it of a Persian." And in Clélie, Pt. VIII, we are told that one is to "tie himself to the customs of the places of which there is mention; keep from making laurels grow in countries where one never sees them; avoid the confusion of either the the religions or costumes of peoples." So far, I repeat, good. But everywhere we find added to such modern words as these one damaging reservation: "one may with discretion (jugement) slightly accommodate things to the usages of the country in which one lives, in order to please the more." Is it necessary to suggest that upon the phrase "plaire davantage" it is not merely Mlle. de Scudéry's fame that has been --or will be-- shattered? "Plaire davantage" may have many and various applications in various ages. And, as I have said, Mlle. de Scudéry did not shut her eyes to this unhappy weakness in her strongly-entrenched walls. In the preface to Almahide (1660) she made an effort to save herself from the assaults of the merciless critics. Her readers and she, we are again assured, prefer gallant love before everything; her practice has been bitterly assailed; she will, accordingly, turn to a period still not remarkably well-known, but one believed to be essentially "gallant"-- the gaily sunset of Granada's Moorish rulers. Beyond this admission Mlle. de Scudéry did not go, and, despite her genius, she has paid the penalty. Requiescat in pace.

In the case of the chivalric and the pastoral romances, we found a large part of the contemporary theory of these forms implicit in the comments and practice of satirists. On the theory of the heroico-historical romance these useful beings add little or nothing to the explanations of Calprenède and Mlle. de Scudéry. Nor is it necessary here to recount the evidences of the popularity and influence of this form of romance. Instead it is time to fulfill our promise to analyze the work of two important and professed critics of fiction-- Bishop Huet in the Traité de l'Origine des Romans (1670) and Abbé Lenglet-Dufresnoy in the De l'Usage des Romans (1734). And in order to understand their theories a bird's-eye glimpse of the Calprenédian and Scudérian attitude will be useful.

In aim Mlle. de Scudéry and Calprenède sought both to amuse and to edify, following in these "purposes" the track of d'Urfé, Gomberville, and others; Mlle. de Scudéry had, in addition, a desire to support religion. For their subject-matter

both romancers turned to history, and both, it is interesting to note, chose as their final fields of effort epochs nearer to their own than had been those of their earlier productions; yet we also observe that Calprenède in vain exerted himself to win the title of historian rather than romancer, whereas Mlle. de Scudéry openly laughed at bondage to the facts of past ages-- this divergence being traceable to Mlle.'s theories of aesthetic delight and emotional effect as ultimately dependent upon the use of the vraisemblable in preference to the true. Thus Calprenède stressed war as his main appeal, and Mlle. de Scudéry love. Thus Calprenède was driven to violate poetic justice, while Mlle. de Scudéry upheld it. Thus Calprenède endued his Persians and Romans with the courtliness and the formality of the circle of Louis le Grand, and expressed no defense; Mlle. de Scudéry, sinning even more, erected the glittering evasions of her intricate doctrine of vraisemblance, with, unluckily, its fatal hidden passage of the "plaire devant tout." Apart, finally, from all these matters, were their views of structure. Both Calprenède and Mlle. de Scudéry chose plots which were highly complex, a retrospective method of narration, and an opening in medias res. Still, while Mlle. de Scudéry was led by her love for poetry, conversation,and letters to the weaving of such webs as fly loose in all directions, Calprenède, using unity of place as an effective tool, produced a texture closely and finely woven.

To return, now, to Huet's Traité sur l'Origine des Romans. A single reading of this essay leaves two facts clearly imprinted upon the mind. First, Huet's critiques of romances are often pleasant chit-chat, and at times as absurd as Sorel's.[37] Second, Huet is a classicist in poetry, and is not unwilling to fasten the chains of rigid theory upon prose romance. For in his eyes there must be a something which will distinguish a "regular romance" from all other types of fictional rabble. Moreover, this "regular romance" has a good many more differentia than are suggested in his first careless definition(p.3): "Fictions of love adventures, disposed into an elegant style in prose, for the delight and instruction of the reader."[38] It must be (83) "composed after the rules of an heroic poem;" it must (65) have a dominating action; it must be "regular" and decorous (83); it must be in prose (3); it must

(71) repudiate all [illegible] and base detail, it shall not be concerned with war or politics but by accident" (8); and it ought to have vraisemblance (45)-- though (74) the fantasy and comphat, which 'exactly enough observed' this requisite, "is not according to the rules of a romance." Naturally, with this formidable list of "necessaries" before his mind, Huet gets into inextricable difficulties when he discusses the romances which are and those which are not "regular." Undaunted, however, he proceeds to distinguish between the heroic poem and the "regular" romance. He finds four divergences (7-8). The romance, in that it should not employ a deus ex machina or treat of gods and demigods, is to be more probable (vraisemblable), but less sublime and exalted than the heroic poem; it may move rather than war for its principal subject; it is to be "more simple," though intercalated and double plots are not objectionable; finally --saving clause-- it may be less "regular and correct" in "contrivance," i.e., it may employ "events and episodes," though not "accidental descriptions" (78).

More important for our quest than these "twice-told" rules of Huet is his doctrine that the intelligent reader is the author's finest critic, his surprising recognition of the rights of the imagination, and his evident and almost prophetic outlook toward the Princesse de Cleves and its followers. The third of these topics has already been suggested; the romance of war --the Calprenédian theme, in other words-- was doomed; love will henceforth approach nearer and nearer to the realistic conception of it as a passion impatient of all insincerity. The two other topics demand amplification. Readers of romances Huet seems to divide (p.121 seq.) into two classes;:those who appreciate artistic composition, and those who (129), "ignorant and simple, are sensible of no more than what strikes upon the imagination and stirs their passions." In the account of the appeal to the latter class there is almost nothing new; Mlle. de Scudéry had expounded far better than Huet the importance of both imagination and emotion in fiction, although she had not laid such weight as does he upon the moral effect of arousing only chaste emotions (143). But the appeal to the former class is significant; to me, at least, it means that the author was no longer to theorize upon what he would do, without taking into due considerat-

ion the rights of the intelligent public. I may be wrong; but I see in the Traité of Huet the first enunciation of the law of social criticism, as it has since been applied to prose fiction. If, however, this service to criticism be problematical, another is not. Despite all Huet's inconsistencies, he apparently passes far beyond even Mlle. de Scudéry's attitude toward truth in fiction. So far, then, is he from the general air of the period which we have so often referred to-- the search for bald fact! "Romances," says Huet (9), are not only sometimes "false in the gross, and true in some particulars," but they may be altogether false in whole, and every particular." This, of course, is no contradiction of that part of the "effort to secure belief" which aimed at probability and verisimilitude.

After Huet's Traité, the next works to be devoted to fiction were Valincour's Lettres sur la Princesse de Clèves (1678) and the almost immediate rejoinder of Charnes, Conversations sur la Critique de la Princesse de Clèves. Neither these nor the ill-natured Télémacomanie (1700?) concern us here. But when we reach Gomplet-Dufresnoy's L'Usage des Romans (1734), we find a peculiar situation in the land of romance. The first of Gomplet-Dufresnoy's stout little volumes --the other is a bibliography-- seems to the casual reader a serious recapitulation and augmentation of the Calprenède-Scudéry-Huet theory of romance. Upon a second or third perusal the reader grasps the truth. The L'Usage des Romans may be analyzed as a contribution to the theory of fiction, which illustrates the persistence of the old views in a day of new practices. I am quite sure that the work is, on the contrary, a reproduction of the theory of romance, in such a way as to render it eminently ridiculous. The reader is constantly titillated by sly comments which remind him that Crébillon's Tanzaï et Néadarné is on the eve of scandalizing Europe, and that among future French fictionists are to be Rousseau, Voltaire, Restif de la Bretonne, and the Marquis de Sade. Indeed, we are near the parting of the ways for French and English fiction. And if we ask why the "chastity" and "propriety" of the romance have become targets for ridicule, the answer is not to be made in a moment. In order to reply, and thus to comprehend the content of the L'Usage des Romans, we must follow the stream of fiction from the time of the stagnation of the great reservoir, the heroico-histori-

cal romance, until we arrive on the banks of some strange waters, where sits the cynical Dufresnoy.

The stagnation of the long romance was practically certain by 1670, the year of the publication of the Cyde-- though the shallow waters flow in to the eighteenth century by the aid of a few accessions of Scudérian type, and by intermingling with the Oroonoko (1688) and such rivulets as The Noble Slaves (1722). And because of this stagnation, so I firmly believe, three streams which had long run silently gathered force. One of these was the psychological novel proper, which had not only appeared in isolated instances, as in Cyssander and Callista (1617) or Chrysolite (1627), but had been visible as a current in the long romance, as in the outbreak of Astyages against formal courtship. From the time of the Portugese Letters (1669) and the Princesse de Clèves (1678), it did not lack tributaries of importance, such as Marianne or Manon Lescaut. A second of the streams was the historical novel, which constantly meandered across the psychological, notably in the domains of Mme. d'Aulnoy. The third of the streams, and the one whose course Dufresnoy examines with affected horror, may be called the "disguised personal history."

This itself had had three sources-- the long romances of allegory, such as Desmarets's Endymion (1624), Mairet's Galatée (1635), or Du Ryer's La Ville Supposée (1648); the shorter "personnages-déguisés" tales moving in the long romances and even in the novels of manners; and, finally, such anomalous things as Le Premier Acte du Tyrannic Nocturne des Tribades, Ecornes, Enormes, Prospetides & la ruine des biens, vie, et honneur de Valentine (1608) or L'Isle des Hermaphrodites (1617), "which is a satire against some mignons of King Henri III." The long romances and most of the shorter histories were pure; the anomalous things were-- not. By 1656, however, the disguised history was rapidly losing its purity; with the inflowing of a 1660 tributary, Bussy-Rabutin's Histoire Amoureuse des Gaules, its turbidity attracted much attention; and when it joined about 1680 with the "memoir", it broadened into a very Lac de Corrompre. From this came out two arms. One turned back toward the original and pure source, as in Prévost's Mémoires d'un homme de Qualité. The other rushed into that Terre Inexprimable, where it was to be renamed the chron-

igue scandaleuse, and to mingle its foul waters with those of the novel of manners, as in Isaac Laquedem (1707), the voyage imaginaire, as in les Aventures de Telaque (1715), and the frame-work conte de fées, as in the New Atalantis (1709) and the Island Adjacent to Utopia (1726).

Certainly Dufresnoy, whom we left carefully describing all these streams -- and more, had in 1734 material for a critique on prose fiction, which should be utterly unlike Huet's. But romance was pure, and the new fiction anything rather than pure; and an abbé can not openly espouse immorality. Therein lies the explanation for his masquerading volume. Furthermore, in his secret enjoyment of the works he banishes far from the land of romance, lies Lenglet-Dufresnoy's significance for the history of fictional criticism. Dufresnoy, it is true, seeks to conceal his attitude by warning us of his inconsistencies: "It is well to announce that there are several contradictions in my work, even from the first chapter." As his comment on les Dames Galantes, his distinction between virtue, i.e., chaste love, and passion, and his list of novels fitted to each lustrum of life, the Decameron, one notes, to flameless old age -- these utterances point not only his inconsistency, but his levity. Accordingly, when all the hoary apologies for the existence of prose fiction are solemnly marshalled, we feel that the long struggle begun by Boccaccio is over -- that prose fiction has come into its birthright, freedom of imagination and freedom of subject. What though we hear again that fiction is truer than history, that the novel is not so lascivious as poetry, that it educates the young by the sweetness of example, that it inculcates the politesse of the beau monde; side by side with these age-old defenses, we learn that both Jesuits and Jansenists write fiction, that men of high repute have lent their aid to the hitherto-contemned art, and that the world -- all the world -- loves a story-teller. Were we to push beyond 1740, we should find the results of this theory of Dufresnoy, good and bad. At least it is clear that fewer and fewer prefaces are serious in their apologies -- when they deign to use them.

[illegible]

[illegible] before 1715, as has been sufficiently remarked, no other type of prose fiction worked out a theory comparable in completeness to that of the romance, particularly the heroico-historical species. Furthermore, most of the theory which was present has already been presented in the preceding chapters in discussions of the professed aims of fiction and the "effort to force belief." Yet, since there are to be found many comments upon the content, structure, and method peculiar to this or that form of fiction, it seems necessary to take up one by one those types which we have already recognized as distinct from each other-- the realistic works, the letter-novel, the chronique scandaleuse, the voyage imaginaire, the [illegible] conte de fée. At times, I may say, I shall have no hesitation in sketching the historical development of one or another form of fiction, if such a sketch seems desirable as a sidelight upon the general ground of contextual theory for that type. I hope that digression for the sake of completeness will seem permissible.

It will be remembered that, according to our classification of the types of realistic fiction, there were four species of this genus-- the picaresque tale, the novel of manners, the psychological-historical novel, and the psychological novel proper. The first of these forms, the picaresque tale, is commonly defined as a prose narrative centering in rather loose fashion about a rogue. For our purposes, however, this demarcation from other forms of fiction will not suffice; in following the authors of picaresque relations, we need a definition broad enough to permit of heroes other than rogues, and to retrieve the element of rogue-story, clearly distinguishable in structure. Perhaps this definition will do: the picaresque tale is a series of adventures of dubious tone, all more or less connected with the life-story of a criminal, roguish, or victimized personage.

Expression of the theory which rises upon a criminal hero, because he is a criminal, is hard to find; the reason for such reticence we have amply discussed (p. 23). Perhaps the clearest confession is that in the preface to the French translat-

lon in 1734 of Alonso de Navarrete's Aventuras de Quixalite (1642). In the appendix of the heroine, the 'polo-cat' of Seville, we hear nothing: "The author wished, under the feigned name of Rufina, to draw the portrait and to display all the subtleties of a pretty woman of Seville, the most clever among the thieves, even the most cunning ones; the most to envy among lovers; and the damage received were the purse than the heart of those who had the misfortune to find her beautiful." If theory which sees the criminal hero there is more true; the profession to Breton's Amories of Seville (1630), to Furetière's Roman bâtard (1671), and to Tristan l'Hermite's La Mariane (1636) are here no guide. Sorel writes (1626): 'All the stories that you have been told are to the subject, namely.... you have my comedy adventures.... But as for the greater part of historical theory emphasizes the use of an engaging scoundrel, not always killed from a rogue." Nashe Filton's 'dreams' are to be Nashe's topic; Lazarus, the 'Spanish Squire,' justifies his actions before the good themselves; and Head wrote, for once sincerely, (preface to the English rogue, 1680, p. 6): 'Come! did I call him! I should recall that word, since his actions were attended more with wisdom than life-destroying stratagems."

If, however, we follow Head a little further, we read. "It is manifest the whole cast of his mind tended to little else than knavishry; or necessity frequently compelled him to perpetuate villainy." This means, of course, that the rogue passes readily into the criminal; and our distinction between the two may seem useless. It would be, were not the results of the "criminal-hero" theory different from those of the "rogue-hero" theory. With Lesage, Defoe, and others, the authors' spirits must be cleared of the suspicion of encouraging immorality. The "moral lie" is forced to the front. And at once we have a distinction drawn by the authors themselves between earlier and later forms of the picaresque tale-- a distinction made very sharp in the late eighteenth century. One form of the picaresque tale flouted the "moral lie" and declared allegiance to a structure, consisting of a string of incoherent adventures; the other emphasized critical incidents in the life of a hero who was improving or retrograding. It should also be noted that the tales with victimized heroes neither moved toward nor turned away from coherence, except through

the course of individual authors.

However early the recognition of the two forms of picturesque romance may be, it is seen most clearly in the era of Fanny, Evelyn, and Le Sage. Throughout as *The Life and Death of Mr. Badman* (1680), the reader's responding does not alter the fact that the volume is built of selective incidents; and this theory is implied in Burgess's preface: "At most men's funerals.... there are sometimes.... presented to their friends by their over-busy-brought writers... and therefore have I drawn him forth in his postures and actions from his childhood to his gray hairs." On the other hand, just as Hamilton in his *Memoirs of Grammont* flouted the "moral aim" (v.p.22), so does he scorn selective incident: "I declare.... that the order of time or the arrangement of facts, which cost more to the writer than they divert the reader, will embarrass me little in the disposition of these memoirs. What does it matter, after all, where one commences a portrait, provided that the assemblage of parts forms a whole which correctly produces the original?" Midway between these antagonistic positions stands the theory of the author of *Anna Hermsdyk* (1797)— a theory interesting also as indicating some of the tendencies of the pseudo-memoir of that period. The preface says: "The reader ordinarily expects to find in memoirs some particular facts which have escaped the researches of historians, secret intrigues, secrets of the cabinet, conspiracies, conversations between princes and ministers, letters which are wrote to them, or which are received from them.... But this supposition will soon disappear, when the reader is informed that here the question is only of the life of a woman, who, born and reared in very singular fashion, after having had a great number of adventures.... indeed, can tell not nothing which regards wars, politics, or the affairs of the great world. There are only adventures.... sometimes comic, sometimes tragic, and very often [always] gallant."

Speaking broadly, the second variety of realistic fiction, the novel of manners, is separated from the picturesque by its desire to portray, not a life-story, but a group of "characters", these "characters" being in every case contemporary and drawn with what is claimed to be accuracy. Thus much of the general theory of this form of fiction gains constant expression. Frequently expressed, too, is a kind of cor-

theory of romance-- to force upon the novel of manners the technique of Restoration comedy. Unfortunately, to quote theory at once would be to misrepresent the actual situation of the novel of manners in the 17th and early 18th centuries. We shall see why, if we turn again to consider the development of this form of fiction.

In the 17th century Scarron's Roman comique (1651) is a dividing line between the old novel of manners and the new. Before this date, whether we have such an amorphous development of the Italian novella as Bandello's Novelle (1554), such a half-picaresque tale as Nicolay's Navigations (1567), such a series of portraits as Firmian's Lettres vallones (1631), such a dialogue-fiction as de Flau's Aventures de Jarot et Barnette (1617), or such a traveler's tale as de Lancre's Tableau de l'inconstance (1612), we have nothing that has plot or unifying interest. Sorel's Polyandre (1648) starts well with a love-story, but shatters on its author's expressed wish to portray "originals." Scarron's Roman comique, however, has a plot, a well-defined group of characters, and the unifying emotional interest of love. After Scarron the novel of manners pursues again divergent paths,—some, as it seems, uninfluenced by him. These various paths are best illustrated by the Roman bourgeois (1666), with love-interest constantly present, but subordinated to the depiction of contemporaries; the Roman comique, which turns back to the shapelessness and the magic of the Lettres vallones; the Incognita (1692), wherein a rapid play of intrigue goes on within a carefully-contrived plot; and, finally, the Amorous Divells (1714), which can be described no better than to declare that if the present day it would be called a novel-- rather unusually constructed, and with ridiculous names for its characters.

With what is, I trust, a clearer comprehension of the vagaries of the early novel of manners, let us address to the first point of theory upon which practically every example of this form of fiction carves. This is the need to depict life as it is. At once we meet our old friend, vraisemblance. At times we must be wary of him. For instance, when we read the preface to a 1734 edition of an 1711 novel we

Painter (1566), we are likely to find an eighteenth century "realistic" interpretation of the Middle Ages. The translator writes: "the author avails himself of the license common to almost all romancers; for he takes, for his foundation, an event...that could be experimentally [illegible] proving its seriousness or truth. He lays the scene of his romance (sic) at the court of King Juen, and of the queen, Bonne; now this Bonne of Bohemia, was never known by the rank of queen .... [illegible]... It was necessary for the author to say the plot under Charles the Sixth." And the translator is not using [illegible] as Moral, Sentron, Fabliau, le petit, Conte, and others expect it (sometimes they avoid it); for them, as for the author of the Generous Rivals, vraisemblance or verisimilitude is true to the natural and, usually, to the dirty side of life. In our analysis of the attitude of the realists toward romance this has been abundantly proven; the testimony of Sage Roman is here endorsed. He prefaces thus the final text of the Petite Cithere in 1730. "In order to render it more worthy of seeing the day under a different guise, it has seemed necessary to recast it and to put it, so to speak, in the fashion. [illegible] the world is always the same, there is in it a constant succession of originals who appear to present some change.... As for me, who in my ambition is content with [illegible] I am content with offering a picture in miniature of the manners of the century."

The second important element of the theory of the novel of manners was not, we have said, fully announced until the [illegible]. It would be repetitive to attempt more quotations upon this desire-- the attempt to relate the function of the novel of manners to that of satirical comedy (~~verbe~~); suffice it to say that the prefaces of Congreve, Le Sage, Scarron, Prévillé, and others carry it down the centuries. [illegible], however, we may be sure, is Congreve's theory of the proper structure for the novel of manners. Though he seems to have had no followers before 1750, his [illegible] was re-ridden at intervals; the [illegible] seeds he scattered took root before the Incognita is written. "And like reverence as it spoken, and the parallel kept at a due distance, there is something of equality in the proportion which they [romance and novel] bear in reference to one another, still that between

comedy and tragedy.... I mention in another breath so little dramatic writing, namely, in the design, contexture, and result of the plot.... The design of the novel is obvious after the first meeting of Horatio and Hippolito with Isabella and Leonora, and the difficulty is in bringing it to pass, maugre all apparent obstacles, within the compass of two days. How many probable conditions intervene in opposition to the main design, viz., of marrying two couple.... As also whether every obstacle does not in the progress of the story act as subservient to that purpose, which at first it seems to oppose. In acomedy this would be called the unity of action; her it may pretend to no more than an unity of contrivance. The scene is continued in Florence from the commencement of the amour; and the time from first to last is but three days." [17] Evidently, we have in Congreve's theory the suggestion of closely-woven plot, related sub-plot, obstacle and solution, and the unities. Moreover, the opening of Incognita, the melodramatic quality of what might be called the scenes of the action, the rush of incident, and, above all, the hurried close, with its artful grouping of all the actors upon the stage and its swift synopsis of the dénouement-- these prove that Congreve's practice corresponded with his theory.

It is not really difficult to identify picaresque traits between 1678 and 1740; it is more of a problem to separate the novel of manners from its realistic brethren; but neither of these tasks is so complicated as the effort to disentangle from 17th century fiction the historical-psychological novel-- the third of the realistic forms, as we have classified them. One may, I fancy, trace its genesis beyond Bits's curious Guerras Civiles de Granada (1596). But certainly it was from this source that the influential Cervantean novella seems to have drawn the Moorish coloring of some of its "exemplary" representatives. And to this the heroico-historical romance turned for material in Duverdi's Don Zelime (1626) and Mlle. de Scudéry's Almahide (1660). From which of these forms of fiction, however, was the historical-psychological novel born? With what work, moreover, was the transition effected? Perhaps one may find a transition in Mme. de Lafayette's Zayde, published in 1771, but almost certainly written in 1656. In any event, by 1678 a new type of fiction was born, whether with the Comtesse de Murat's Comte de Dunois, Saint-Real's Don Carlos, or some work

not yet unearthed. The new type differed normally from the romance. It was short; it opened with historical orientation; its narrative was straightforward; it had discarded the Chinese-box structure in favor of a fairly timely plot and a few main characters; finally, it sought to depict historical events as they had "actually been." By 1750 its types were many and varied. The principal ones were the scandalous chronicle of the past, such as the Histoire secrète de Laure de Laurimbelle (1695); the incoherent memoir, such as Sandras's Cleveland (1707); the cross with the novel of manners, such as Prévost's Cleveland; and the narrative which in all essentials save genius suggests Scott, such as the admirable Comte de Comminges of Mme. d'Aulnoy (1704). With the theory of the scandalous chronicle and of the memoir we are not at present concerned. And the theory of the historical work of Chevalier's type is practically that of the more truly historical work of the Comte de Warwick type.

Undoubtedly, the theory of the historical-psychological novel of the late 18th century can be deduced by a modern critic from the Princesse de Clèves (1678). But with this type, no more than with other forms of fiction, need one rely upon deductions. Various authors of historical-psychological novels express the salient elements of the theory of this form-- its choice of material proper to its genre, its wish to compress its narrative, its interpretation of vraisemblance. Possibly the quest for the unities of time and place invaded this type also. I know no expressed theory upon that topic.

One might premise, without opening a single historical-psychological novel of our period, that the choice of material in any given work would largely depend upon its relation to the heroico-historical romance. Such a premise would be justified. For on the one hand, we find reiterated the love of Mlle. de Scudéry for the spectacular, provided it be not over-used; and on the other we hear many appeals that the unexciting details of history be fully set forth, as they affected the life of this or that personage. The Scudérian view is approved by Prévost and, to some extent, by Sandras-- though Prévost's connotation for the word "spectacular" is not that of Mlle. Prévost writes: "If one finds in this history some surprising adventures, one ought to remember that it is this which renders them worthy of being communicated to the public. Ordinary events interest too little, to merit to be transcribed."

The view which opposes this stand is best seen in the preface to Lenoble's Eldegarte (1694): "The taste in books changes fashion among the French as do costumes. The long romances full of speeches and fabulous adventures, and empty of things which ought to remain in the mind of the reader and there bear fruit, were in vogue in the time when sugar-loaf hats were found beautiful. One has worried almost at the same time of the one and the other, and the little histories (petites histoires), ornamented with embellishments which the truth can suffer, have taken their place, and have been found more proper to the French genius, which is impatient to see in two hours the dénouement and the end of that which it commences to read.... it is neither a fiction nor a romance (ni une fable ni un roman) which I give you, it is the pure truth of history."

In quoting from Eldegarte we have illustrated not only the desire to avoid the spectacular, but also the desire to compress-- which was to be our second topic. Vraisemblance, our third, needs elaboration. The meaning of vraisemblance, it is true, is quite as clear for the historical-psychological fictions as it was for the novels of manners. In fact, were it not that the theory of the historical-psychological novel is certainly descended from Clie. de Scudéry and Calprenède, one might safely assert that the opinions of the novelists of manners are being applied to historical subjects. In any event, with the new school, vraisemblance implies the reproduction of the deeds and surroundings of past worthies. For once the fullest treatment of the subject comes from England. It lies in the preface to Boyle's Theodora and Didymus, published 1687, but claiming to have been written (in another style) twenty years earlier. Boyle tells us how he came to weave a plot about some insignificant martyrs of Antioch; how he strove to realize his characters as Roman Christians; and how he studied the question of their mode of speech. That Boyle's practice was not one-tenth so successful as Mme. d'Aulnoy's picture of the court of Edward IV or Lenoble's study of a Norwegian queen does not injure his theory. It is evident that he tried to live up to it.

Of the genesis of his simple tale of Theodora's last days and death, Boyle tells us this: "finding her story to be related (in a Martyrology, not only very succinctly and imperfectly, but very dully, too, I found myself tempted to enlarge this sto-

ry.... into a somewhat voluminous romance." His method, he continues, will not be "to feign surprising adventures," but to "lead speeches fit for the persons." It is unfortunate, perhaps, that he also felt bound to make Theodora a princess: "I remember to have, in some author or other, found mention made of a person about Diocletian's time, whom I took for our martyr, that was intimated to be of high quality, if not a princess." But Boyle is most interesting when he turns to his consideration of characterization and custom. His intent is to depict "a virgin, who, being as modest and discreet.... a Christian and pious.... was to own a high esteem for an excellent lover (also a Christian), and an uncommon gratitude to a transcendent benefactor, without entrenching either upon her virtue or her reservedness." Naturally, he further maintains, such a heroine would sermonize-- and so Theodora does, in discourse which even in Boyle's day "might be spared." For did not "Didymus and Theodora" live "in primitive and devout times of the church," when Christian men and maidens used conversations, which would be somewhat strange, if they were ascribed to a young gallant, and a younger lady of our degenerate times?" Are not those, too, who question his use of customs forgetting that we are "inclinable to estimate the affairs of past times and remote regions by the opinions and customs of our own age and countries"? Why, e.g., should some "think it strange that.... so pious a person as Theodora offer her breast to Didymus's sword, and by soliciting him to kill her, temt him to an action, which would make her guilty of a murder, and make him greatly accessory to it"? St. Jerome himself approves of suicide in the "case of an inevitable danger of a rape."

Such remarks as Boyle's upon the consistent depiction of historical character suggest that our fourth form of realistic fiction --the psychological novel proper-- must sometimes be inseparable from the psychological-historical works. Discrimination is on occasions difficult. Yet between the two groups are differences. The psychological-historical fictions stress (as with Boyle) the actual personality and environment of a hero from ages more or less remote from the writer's. The psychological novels proper try to present with power and truth the emotions that seem to be basic in every human being. That they then deal almost exclusively with love --even if it be the love of les fetichistes, les invertis, l'Hermaphrodite, etc.-- is self-evident.

Naturally, no age produces many genuine psychological novels; and the pre-Richardsonians can boast of even fewer than the nineteenth century. [illegible] Chrysolite (1637), Die Adriatische Rosemunde (1645), La Princesse de Clèves (1678), Marianne (1731), and Manon Lescaut (1732), we cite masterpieces of fiction. Even, we exhaust the list of early psychological novels-- save for the failures. But for our purposes these "failures" are peculiarly interesting. The masterpieces do not seem to have tempted their authors to lay bare their modes of appeal. On the other hand, the "failures" contain in their prefaces much theorizing, which, in general, can be summed up under one of the following heads: emphasis upon emotion as a source of interest; preference for the treatment of contemporary or very recent themes; and selection of emotional crises as the stages of a narrative most to be dwelt upon.

We have seen that the theory that erotic emotion was the proper source of fictional interest, was scarcely voiced before 1740 save by Boccaccio and by the author of Les Aventures de ..... (1713) ; even in the Scudérian fabric its importance is not indicated except in relation to vraisemblance. Accordingly, little can be added to our earlier quotations, save two passages, one from Boursault's Lettres Amoureuses d'Une dame à un Cavalier (1678), the other from Crebillon's Lettres de la Marquise de M.... au Comte de N.... (1732). That the passages are from erotic letter-novels does not prevent the citation of them in explanation of the theory of the psychological novel; the two forms crossed in content, though not in structure, during this period. Boursault writes simply: "One will see the progress, the violence, and the end of a love which lasted more than fifteen years, with the intrigues of which use was made, the misfortunes which have been undergone, and the obstacles which have been surmounted." Crebillon is more definite: "Little dissatisfactions, reconciliations, flights of caprice, warm resentments, and flowing tears, joys, jealousies, and apprehensions, fears, impatient wishes, and despairs are liberally diffused; and though these emotions are varied in the description, yet love is the only cause from whence they derive their existence and receive their extinction."

It is inevitable, of course, that with emphasis upon a love which is not formal, but realistic, there should come attention to men and women below the rank of princes and princesses,—men and women, in most cases, of one's own day. The greater

part of the material dealing with this movement is germane to general views upon characterization in fiction, and is accordingly left for later discussion. Yet one of the earliest protests in both directions comes from a psychological novel-- Mareschal's Chrysolite (1627); it may well be quoted here. It is true that Mareschal's theory gives little suggestion of the power of his study of Chrysolite, the woman whose fatal love for admiration ends in the loss of the one man whom she has really cared for. Mareschal merely says: "Seeing that there is scarcely to be found anything solid, anything vraisemblable, which can have relation to the manners of men and to their powers, or to the true course of the ages and centuries in the books which are called nomans.... here I have only included what a man can do, and have held myself within the limits of a private life, in order that each may be able to mould himself upon the actions which I describe." But what a marvellously ~~Hermetic~~ invented "private life" it is!

If the desire to depict private life and one's contemporaries is a common result of the wish to analyze the progress of genuine emotion, so is the proposal to select for presentation only such scenes as may be called crises. This phase of the theory of psychological fictions is thus put by Prévost in Manon Lescaut (p.112): "I remark as a result the divers occasions on which my heart felt a return toward good, because it is to this memory that I finally owed a part of my strength in the most unhappy passages of my life." Again, however, one can adduce the words of letter-novelists. Boursault does not explain why among his seven letters three treat of his heroine's slow steps toward a fatal moment of weakness, and four of her situation years afterward. D'Aubignac, on the other hand, notes that for his Roman des Lettres (1667) he chooses seventy out of five hundred which he claims to possess; and Crebillon observes of Lettres de la Marquise de ..... au Comte de .....: "After till my caution .... the connection is interrupted." He can mean nothing save the emotional connection. Thus early had the French discovered the grievous weakness to be urged against Richardson's minute studies in emotion.

For, after all, though we have cited the psychological phase of the novel of letters, its theory, in many of its most interesting examples, sharply cut off from

that of any other form of fiction by the fact that its very mode determines its structure. Let letter be heaped upon letter in the effort to outdo Richardson; the result is still the same: at intervals not to be compared with such breaks as are found between chapters or parts, the connection of the letter-novel is broken. If this is true even of the psychological letter-novel, it is much more true of the letter-novel which had for its [illegible] the presentation of manners. In 1664 the Duchess of Newcastle prefaced her [illegible] letters thus: "The truth is they are rather discourses than letters, for I have endeavored under cover of letters to express the humors of mankind and the actions of man's life by the correspondence of two ladies, living at some short distance from each other." And in 1667 the Roman des Lettres, which has a strong emotional interest, already noted, has for a second goal the depiction of the character of Aristo, the writer, and of a group of [illegible] correspondents. It may be objected that the very disconnected letter-novels are not fiction at all. Where, then, are we to draw the line? I myself have barred out of consideration the Turkish Spy and its numerous successors. But what can one do with Montesquieu's Persian Letters, of which he wrote in the second edition that the public seemed to prefer the romance of Uzbek and his wives to any of his satirical discourses? Yet Uzbek appears in only 37 out of 161 of the letters. To say that the letter-novel is a mere mould for narrative may be logical, and the statement is possibly true to-day. But I am sure that the pre-Richardsonians whom I have been citing thought of it as a type of fiction. I would rather be illogical and give their attitude than be logical and misrepresent it.

Once more, then, in our reproduction of the general theories of fictional types, we arrive at a terminal. Before we seek those forms of fiction which we have ventured to declare neither romantic nor realistic, it is worth while to epitomize, as far as we can, those views in which all the realistic types agreed. In summarizing the theories of romance, we spoke of aim, of content, and of structure; here also we shall use these terms. In aim, then, "insipid purity" was flouted; sublimising presentation of the facts of both the outer and the inner world was considered to carry its own moral lesson,- reinforced, it may be, by sermonettes distributed throughout the text. In content, emphasis was laid, now upon the manners and eccentricities of Londoners,

Parisians, etc., now upon the deeps of human passion; plot, incident, machinery were limited to the probable; poses and stereotyped conversations were denied also to the "universal tongue" which outcasts and criminals, bourgeois and girls, nobles and princesses were discovered to possess. In structure looseness was usually upheld--though the more important fictions secured at least a rough coherence.

It will be recalled that the forms of fiction which we styled neither romantic nor realistic were the chronique scandaleuse, the voyage imaginaire, and the framework conte de fée. These await our attention.

The rise and progress of the chronique scandaleuse before 1740 has been treated in connection with our analysis of the attitude toward fiction of Lenglet-Dufresnoy's L'Usage des romans (1734). This sketch need not be repeated, but we must justify the elements of our definition of the chronique scandaleuse (v. ch.I), i.e., the statements that this type of fiction was either malicious or lascivious in its aim; that it almost always employed personnages déguisées as characters; that it had no hesitation in using supernatural machinery; and that it violently opposed any application to it of the laws of coherence.

Naturally, the chronique scandaleuse did not shout about its real aim; we have already watched its declarations concerning the great value of unbiased satire as a reformatory power in the sphere of ethics, of politics, of religion, etc. Naturally, also, this type of fiction did not insist upon the identification of its victims with contemporaries; the nearest approach it made to expressing this phase of its theory was the publication of long "keys" in appendices to certain badly-printed editions. On the other hand, the value for its purposes of both the use of the supernatural, and of violation of unity, is often remarked.

The progress toward the use of the supernatural is very interesting. In such early examples of the chronique scandaleuse as Le Premier Acte du Sylphe Nocturne des Tribades (1683), the observer, a male, pierces among the 'tribades' in female disguise and notes their plans against an unhappy husband, the young Calianthe. Obviously, however, a human being is limited by vraisemblance in his endeavors to discover secret actions. This is probably the reason why Furetière's unseemly tale in the Roman bourgeois (1666) relates the adventures of Cupid; and why Guevara in El diablo cojuelo (1641)

invented a "genius" who in gratitude to a beneficiary lifts off all the roofs of Madrid by night. In these works, however, no theory is expressed in regard to the use of supernatural powers of observation. The case is different with the Diable boiteux--Le Sage's revision in 1707 of El Diablo cojuelo; here we have in the preface a colloquy between two chimneys called Grand and Petit. The latter chimney remarks: "This is the advantage we chimneys enjoy; we are witnesses to a thousand sights that men would pay any price for seeing." Similarly, Cupid, the supernatural guide of an invisible party "doing" the Island Adjacent to Utopia (1725), says (Vol. 1, p.211): "But the soul-torturing anguish of that lady is not to be expressed, and should I, I who was witness of her secret pangs, her agonizing complaints heard of no ear but mine, etc." These bits of theory may seem insufficient to prove the point I have advanced. If so, any one who chooses may find the theory in full before Crébillon's Le Sopha (1741); Crébillon seems thoroughly aware of the possibilities for his "conte moral" of the life-story of a sofa, which was once a man and which can regain its form only under conditions impossible to reproduce.

The birth of the novel of inanimate objects, however, has led us beyond 1714. It is time to turn to the structural theories of the chronique scandaleuse. Citation from Bussy-Rabutin's Histoire amoureuse des Gaules (1665) and from the preface to Vol. II of Mrs. Manley's New Atalantis (1709) will be enough. Bussy-Rabutin writes (p.147): "Il arrive tous les jours une affaire, qui, sans être de la nature de celles d'Amadis, ne laisse pas de les étouffer pour un temps." Mrs. Manley declares: "The New Atalantis seems, my lord, to be written like Varronian satires, on different subjects, tales, stories, and characters of invention."

To bring forward the entire theory expressed by writers of voyages imaginaires would involve even more repetition than was risked with the chronique scandaleuse. We should have to expound anew the aims of this type of fiction; its insistent effort to force the reader to believe the author; its choice of content; its adherence to and revolt from vraisemblance; and its love for incoherence. Two points in its theory, however, need mention. The one is the recognition of its special appeal, the other the question whether love is an essential element of its composition. Defoe voices excellently the first of these matters; Desfontaines broaches the second. De-

for has this to say in the preface to pt. III of Robinson Crusoe (ed. 1751): "Had I given you the conduct of the life of a man you knew, and whose misfortunes and infirmities, perhaps, you had sometimes unjustly triumphed over, all I could have said would have yielded no diversion.... facts that are formed to touch the mind, must be done a great way off and by somebody never known at." Fontainas writes: "They (the opponents of Gulliver's Travels) complain of not being keen interested by intrigues and by emotional scenes (situations); they expect a fiction according to the rules, and they have found only a succession of allegorical romances, without any amorous adventure.... One has had a certain amount of regard to their taste in this work. Nevertheless, one has only moderately committed himself to this, for fear of departing from the genre." Are not Defoe's words forerunners of those of Stevenson to Henry James? And was it not probably under the influence of Desfontaines that later Wilkins and likewise really Robinson carried to the 19th century the use of love as an ingredient in the recipe which the voyage imaginaire has always been and probably will be? Even as I am writing, I have beside me the first chapter of Sir Conan Doyle's latest offering: The Lost World. Chapter I ends: "this opening chapter will seem to the reader to have nothing to do with my narrative; and yet there would have been no narrative without it.... Was it hardness, was it selfishness that she should ask me to risk my life for her own glorification? Such thoughts may come to middle age; but never to ardent three and twenty in the fever of his first love." Across two centuries Doyle and Desfontaines should grasp hands as theorists.

Much more interesting than the theory of either the chronique scandaleuse or the voyage imaginaire is that of the prose-epic contes de fées; for it illustrates nearly all the tendencies afoot in fiction just before 1740. It emphasizes the prevalent degeneration of moral text in France. It stigmatizes the power of vraisemblance over the most imaginative of all the realms of fiction. It points out the ever-widening distinction between poetical and prose fiction. It indicates the disenchantment with narratives which are neither mere collections of unrelated tales nor yet long unified compositions. It symbolizes the birth of the short story under the necessity of differentiating the appeal of the fanciful tale from that of the roman. Over the first three of these phases of theory it is unnecessay to linger.

As every one knows, the Arabian Nights was translated by Galland in 1704, and was followed in rapid succession by the pretty genuine Turkish and Persian Tales and the wholly fictitious Soirees Bretonnes of Gueulette. Thereafter in England, France, and Germany, imitation trod on the heels of imitation until far into the 19th century. As every one knows, also, the Arabian Nights possesses two peculiarities of technique: all the tales are bound together by the fact that Scheherazade's life depends upon her winning the Sultan's ear for "one thousand and one nights;" and, as a result, the story-telling of each night begins and ends with some reference to this central spur of interest. The relation of this central interest to the appeal of the long romance the translators and imitators were quick to observe; and many of them strove to stress this element in such a way that the collection of "Tales" gained more and more unity. In the preface to the Persian Tales (1710), e.g., criticism is directed against the failure of the Arabian Nights to present "a contest of wills"-- a defect remedied, says Petit de la Croix, in the "present collection." And it is true that in the Persian Tales a princess and her nurse debate about the former's marriage, the one advancing illustrations of unfaithful lovers, the other combatting these arguments by examples of loyal suitors. This, however, is no particular advance toward coherence. But in the Tartarian Tales (1723) the frame-work nearly overbalances the stories included; in the Peruvian Tales (1724) there are only two enormous main narratives; and before the Mogul Tales (1732) there is an apology for the failure to create due suspense: "I should have wished to make you believe that the sultan of Guzurat was truly dead, in order that when he should be seen to reappear, his view, which his sultanas so little expect, should also surprise the reader." Gueulette goes on to lament the impossibility of this arrangement and suggests that there is some compensation in noting the rage of the Sultan, who has pretended death that he may overhear the laudations and wailings of his wives-- and is somewhat disappointed.

The possibilities of the frame-work tale as involving the essential appeal of a romance were studied no more quickly than were the awkward breaks between the "nights." But if the one was cherished, the other was frowned upon. From the publication of the Soirees Bretonnes there is an effort to escape these interruptions of a smooth

flow of narrative. Gueullette writes in this, his first work of the kind; "I have not believed I ought to separate them (the evenings), or include the reflections whic are at the end of each of these tales, as is done in the original. The simplicity (simplicité) of these discourses would certainly have wearied the reader."

As might have been foretold, later authors of the Oriental tale, who found greater and greater difficulty in devising ingenious "frame-works," rebelled against the effort to give to these "collections" the interest of a romance. The revolt in itself is of no importance, save as it points toward the epistle of Otranto and Vathek. Incidentally, however, the Comte de Caylus seems to have turned his eye toward the Contes of La Fontaine and the Tales of Perrault. In his defense of the conte in and for itself he expressed before his Nouveaux Contes Orienteaux (1735) what,i think , is the first step toward the theory of the short story. He states: "Nevertheless it is necessary to agree that one can not be conscious of this relaxation of mind until one has become, so to speak, blasé in regard to romances and the little French histories; these last have ordinarily an intrigue (plot?), a plan, and an end in view (objet), which is developed with order, but the habit which we have of reading them often makes us foresee too easily the dénouement; whereas the Oriental tales have often only one aim, of which the result is to excite surprise at beholding how the smallest incidents bring about the greatest changes."

So much for the general theory of our last type of fiction. Doubtless, as we have presented the opinions of the authors of realistic works, of Ingenieuses scandaleuses, of voyages imaginaires, and of contes de fées, the reader has wondered whether more definite theory of these forms could be found in satires upon them. Very little--unless we turned to the discussion of characterization, setting, and style. The Abbe d'Allancourt in his continuation of Lucian's True History (1634) attacks the conte; Abdallah, Son of Hanif (1712), is aimed at fairy-tales of the type of Mme. d'Aulnoy's Fées Illustres; the Nouveaux Contes Orienteaux (1735) is probably a satire. But neither in these works nor in Wieland's Don Silvio de Rosalva (1764), in Beckford's Vathek (1787), in the succession of Voltaire's brilliant parodies, should we find anything new to us. Of all the satires, Prince Fan-feredin (1735) merits a line or two. For this delightful tale is a sweeping condemnation of all fiction save Telem-

Acidas, the [illegible], and the Princess of Chaves, with especial thrusts at such defenders of fiction as [illegible]-Quixote. Prince [illegible]-Fortin, avid on romance, falls into Arcadia from the mountains of Trebizonia; he wanders through Upper Arcadia, where dwell only the heroes of chivalric, pastoral, and heroico-historical romances; he hears of --thing-- he does not enter-- Lower Arcadia, where "exiles fairies, adventurers, valets, professional beggars, and women of immoral lives;" he passes the Archives of Arcadia and arrives at the capital city and port of the kingdom; he woos and wins the Princess Demonia. Alas! he may not wed her in Arcadia, since there "marriages are not celebrated," and we, too, depart in his train from the land that has so long detained us.

[illegible] Or [illegible]

We have seen that before 1579 three movements were slowly [illegible] possible a recognition of the principle of unity as applied to prose fiction. One was the prevalence of awkward and noticeable formulae of transition; another, effort to be brief; a third, apology for digression. After 1579 the formulae of transition bear little or no relation to unity; their problem passes into that of securing ease in narrative. Efforts at brevity, however, and apologies for digression gain greatly in number and in significance.

Before 1579 the phrase, "to be brief," is often meaningless. After 1579 it is seldom so. Again, the material which is omitted can no longer be listed under a few topics, such as meals, details of armor, accounts of lamentations, etc.. Instead, the omissions refer in considerable variety to such broad topics as substance, characterization, setting, dialogue, structure. At the risk of being tedious, I venture to present one quotation illustrating each point. In regard to substance, e.g., Mrs. Haywood in the Fair Hibernian Virgin writes (p.3) that she omits the business letters which passed between Blanche and Policarpo, "because those of Policarpo were far from anything of that delicacy which alone can render writings of that kind pleasing, and those of Blanche cold, and designed only to oblige answers that might excite laughter in herself and father." (p.43) In regard to character the author of the Generous Rivals says: "It is altogether needless to dilate here upon the various difficulties she found in composing this billiet, and many sheets of gilt-paper she spoiled before she had completed it; whether she wrote it at one or many sittings; with abundance of other such impertinences." In regard to setting Cervantes remarks (Vol. III, p.175 of Don Quixote): "Here the author points out unto us all the circumstances of Don Diego, his house, declaring to us all that a gentleman and a rich farmer's house may have; but it seemed good to the translator, to pass over these and such like trifles, because they suited not with the principal scope of this history, the which is more founded upon truth, than upon bare digressions." In regard to dialogue [illegible] a reporter comments (Princesse

de Montmorier, p.47): "There is no need.... to render an exact account of what passed between Madame and Lisa."

In particular, however, is to be observed the search for brevity in regard to what may be called the aesthetic of structure. The cry of "leave something to the reader's imagination" becomes common. As early as Argyle's Madame and his England we read (p.54): "It were tedious to write (of the sea-customs), for that whosoever hath either read of travelling, or himself used it, can sufficiently guess that is to be said."[3] The principle of the value of conciseness is clearly put. In Mr. Anders (p. 106) one of the characters, Attention, requests of another, Wiseman, that he tell a an incident with "as much brevity" as he "can". Wiseman replies: "Not for any fear of my painting of things." "No," cries Attention's response, "but it pleases me to hear a great deal in few words." Above all, the idea of [illegible] shortening of narratives[4] crops up in numerous revisions of early fictions. The preface to a 1700 reworking of Ford's Montelion (1633), to a 1717 version of Munus's Astomphile (1623), and to a 1732 translation of the Letters of Abelard and Heloise, stand by no means alone. "This little history of Montelion," we are told, "is of ancient standing, published formerly in an old gothick style spun out to a tedious length, with tautologies and unaccountable mixtures, altogether foreign to relations of this nature, in an age grown more polite and concise in its language." "Monsieur the Bishop du Belley," we are informed, "formerly gave this history to the public under the name of Agatonphile. It is easy to see, by the number of more than a thousand pages which compose his book, that it is there much more elaborated than there has been intention of doing here. She has not believe .... that one could succeed in pleasing in this century, where taste is so different."[5]

It would not be difficult to continue indefinitely with quotations showing a genuine advance in the direction of brevity.[6] Yet I am entirely prepared to admit that all such citations are only straws showing which way the wind blows. Of far more importance is the attitude of authors toward digression. Before 1671, it will perhaps be remembered, we found that digressions were classifiable as edifying, informational, descriptive, personal, and narrative. This classification will still hold. It may be remembered, also, that authors occasionally regarded as literary sins the informational,

personal, and descriptive types of digression, but that they rarely proceeded for their edifying; digressions, and never for their narrative.[7]

After 1679, however, the edifying digression in prose fiction encountered more or less determined opposition. It still had strongholds, it is true; we have examined sufficiently its persistence in religious and sentimental romance, in picaresque tales and novels of manners, in reformatory voyages imaginaires, and in chronique scandaleuses. The opinions of Sorel (p.[illegible]), of the author of the Nouveau voyage (p.[illegible]), of Lyly (p.[illegible]), of Dorat (p.[illegible]), of Defoe (p.[illegible]), and of others have been cited. But even amid the strongholds there was, we have also seen, dissatisfaction-- notably in the case of Le Sage (p.[illegible]). Furthermore, author after author apologizes for the use of the edifying digression. Thus it comes about that Prévost's declaration before Manon Lescaut may be said to stand for the general opinions of fictionists in the year 1733: "Far as I am from pretending to the title of an exact author, I do not ignore at all that a narrative ought to be freed from particularities (circonstances) which would render it heavy and clogged."[8]

Like the edifying digression, the informational "insertion" fared variously in different types of fiction from 1679 to 17[illegible]. It is certain that fewer types escaped it than escaped the edifying digression; indeed, only the psychological novel and the chivalric and heroico-historical romance may be called free from its encroachments.[9] Apologies, too, offer no conclusive evidence as to its favor or disfavor; while on the one hand Lyly and Reid are curiously pusillanimous in their "beg-pardons" for turning aside, Barclay, Furetière, Crowne, Fénélon, Mrs. Barker, and a number of others express little or no compunction for their ramblings. All in all, perhaps, the situation in the half-century before 1740 is best illustrated in the practice of Aphra Behn, and in the expressed theories of the reviser of Les Astrées (1714), and of Montesquieu; from what is said of and by them the reader is free to draw his own conclusions. In the famous Oroonoko are seven digressions, beautifully and decidedly informational;[10] the most egregious divagation, that upon English comedies, is quite unmarked, and the 20 pages devoted to life in Surinam is thus carelessly dismissed: "Though this digression is a little from my story....since it contains some proofs of the curiosity and daring of

this great man, I was hardpressed to carry nothing of his character." The Amorelle Astrée, a tiny reduction of d'Urfé's five ealy volumes, takes a view decidedly different from what seems to be Mrs. Behn's; we read in the preface: "I proposed to her to remove all the faults which she had felt through good natural taste, to make a little work of pastoral gallantry, to weaken certain spots a trifle true, which the scrupulous modesty of our century (sic) would not suffer in its books, to purge it of theology, politics, religion, and poetry, to remove all the useless personages, to never lose sight of Astrée and Celadon and on this to avoid the peril of all the long romances, where the hero and heroine appear upon the scene only rarely... which one ceases becoming interested in the series of their adventures, their friends male and female, whom one does not care for so much as for them, occupying ordinarily three quarters of the book." Somewhat before the Astrée heroines enforces this view in a curious fashion: "In common romances digressions can never be admitted, except when they themselves constitute another romance. Reasoning can not be intermixed with the story, because the personages are being brought together to reason, that would be repugnant to the design and purpose of the work. But in the form of letters, wherein personages are introduced at random, and the subjects treated of do not depend upon any design or plan already formed, the author has the advantage of being able to blend philosophy, politics, and morality with romance."[11]

Odd enough, from the point of view of the modern "local-colorist," the descriptive digression was attacked much more vehemently than either the obliging or informational. The reason for this, as we shall observe later (p.), lies inherent in the opposition of the realists to the romancers. And since before 1740 the conflict is irrationally bitter, one can reach no conclusion whatever as to a general attitude of the early eighteenth century toward descriptive digression. This much may be said in anticipation of coming discussion: there is not description in all the types of romance save the satirical, in the psychological-historical novel, in the voyage imaginaire, in the chevalier scandaleuse, and in the conte de fée. Further than this, one can merely range apologists, defenders, and assistants of set description. Among the more significant apologists Basile, Calprenède, Mrs. Manley, and others are to be mentioned; thus Calprenède, describing Statira asleep in a garden, writes: "I could

not forbear making this little description to you (though unseasonable and no way proper to our affliction) when I (praise) remember the time my master spent in considering her."[12] Among the assailants are Cervantes, Huet, Scarron, Furetière, Sorel; it is sufficient here to refer to the remarks of Cervantes, already quoted (p.118). Among the defenders, finally, are Mlle. de Scudéry and her English follower, Mrs. Barker-- almost alone, unless one take the silence of some authors for intended defense of their usage. Mlle. de Scudéry calmly invites the foe of long descriptions to "skip"-- thereby forestalling the theory of one Sir Walter Scott.[13] Jane Barker has a curious passage before the second edition of her Exilius (1719): "In the next place, 'twas (1st edition) liked, because 'twas free from long speeches, and tedious descriptions of towns, places, sieges, battles, horses, and their furniture. Nevertheless, I have since put in one description....those who love not descriptions may pass it over unread."[14]

Edifying, informational, and descriptive digressions in 17th century fiction are easily identified; the title, personal digression, is a literary mantle, much like that of charity in ethics. For in our period, as a casual reader would declare, the digressions which I have summed under "personal" are so ubiquitous and so frequent as to sin.[15] It is noteworthy, too, that authors stoutly maintain their right to button-hole the reader at any convenient break in the story, in order to whisper their confidences. Apologies for this action there are in plenty;[16] but somehow they are not like the serious misgivings upon the other non-narrative types of digression. Swift, Sterne, and Congreve are positively delightful in their bold assumption of this privilege. And, indeed, Swift alone seems inclined to oppose this "joy of the author" -- even while, with characteristic irony, using the privilege to the full. One citation from Congreve will show how distinct the term had become by anticipation: "Nor the reader I suppose to be upon thorns at this end the like impertinent digressions, but let him alone and he'll come to himself; at which time I think fit to acquaint him, that when I digress, I am at that time writing to please myself; when I continue the thread of the story, I write to please him; supposing him a reasonable man, I conclude him satisfied to allow me this liberty, and so I proceed."[17]

but let us hasten from Congreve to Swift, how a reformer cannot consist with his theory of "not one word which does not relate to the subject" should approve that before 1748 there was no literary convention in regard to the "pertinent" digression. On this point Swift's Tale of a Tub is suggestive. Of the eleven chapters of the work, the second, fourth, sixth, eighth, and eleventh deal with the story; the third is a digression on critics, the fifth a digression "in modern kind," the seventh a digression on digression itself, the ninth and tenth a digression on madness. Chapter three opens with an apology to the reader for the fact that Swift must stop to placate the critics, who cannot "be on any hand be pursuaded from their ventures." In somewhat similar fashion, there are editorial requests for pardon at the close of chapters five and seven, and at the opening of eleven—this time apparently not for chapters nine and ten. Indeed, of all the digressions, great and small, in the volume, only three are let pass unapologized: the ironical account of the value of the book (p.106), the appeal to posterity (115), and the remarks on memory (141). Now, were it not for chapter seven Swift might or might not pass for a conventional exponent of digression. In this chapter, however, is convincing proof that Swift did not approve of digression. With that irony which ever underlies Swift's "digression" the "great modern improvement," and explains that objections to it come from "morose, distracted, ill-bred people."

What, then, are the differing points of view, before 1748, on the non-narrative types of digression. May we draw from this array of opinions any definite conclusion concerning an advance in the direction of tolerance to the story proper? If diminution in the amount of digression be a criterion, we can. Aside from this, attack and defense would seem to neutralize each other. Only superficially, however, in my judgment. For one thing, the process involves, as can not too often be said, the relation of a specific type of fiction to digressions rather than the rule. For another, the influence of Le Sage, Prévost, Montesquieu, Hunt, Swift, and others was not of a kind to be lost sight of in the future. On the whole, it seems safe to say that after Le Sage the edifying digression is more prominent than before; that after Prévost preaching is at least relegated to the mouth of some character of a given fiction; that after Montesquieu the appearance of Brooke's Fool of Quality and Sterne's Tristram Shandy is

are signs. For a discussion as to whether these can be called fictions; that often [illegible] there has of necessity to appear a theory of 'setting'; and that often [illegible] the personal digression was more apt more to be inimical to the opening and middle of chapters.

The question of the fifth type of digression --the narrative-- is far more complex than that of any of its sin. For the narrative digression itself has distinct subdivisions, which are differently viewed by authors. One may distinguish four such subdivisions: verse which has nothing to do with the story being narrated; the prose tale read or told by some one of the characters, and, in order to while away an idle hour; the autobiography [illegible] by some person [illegible] of his dramatis personae "begins anew"; and, finally, such adventures of "friends" of [illegible] characters, as may be loosely interwoven into the main action.

In discussing non-narrative types of digression in fiction we were often forced to hedge and to make reservations. On the other hand, in treating the case of the verse-digression we are on fairly solid ground. We may point to the frequency of verse in fiction before 1670, and to its infrequency thereafter.[19] We may go on to attribute this fact to Sorel's declamations against romance-writing upon heroic and to Boileau's representation of Uranie with a madrigal to the "enemy [illegible] loves." It is true that we may not counter the assaults of the realists with any theory of the value of unity; the reports of Sorel, Furetière, Scudéry, and others contradict any such assumption.[20] Let it be noted, the sole expression of theory is that of Lille. Scudéry is favor of verse in fiction, nor yet that of her enemies against it. It is, I take it, significant enough of the attitude of writers toward verse-digression after 1700 that the Nouvelle Astrée (v. p. 121) was to be freed from "poesy", and that Mrs. [illegible] Tinsley in 1715 published a "subscription" edition of the Iroaile, "suppressing the verses-- an 'improvement' attributed in the preface to the requests of the subscribers.[22]

If, on the whole, verse-insertions in fiction were deemed improper from 1670 to the time of Mrs. Radcliffe, the situation was quite otherwise with all but the first type of the prose narrative digressions. And over this type --the inserted "novel" told to while away the time-- we might summarily pass, were there not an important passage up-

on it is Don Quixote. For, as a matter of fact, the narrative thread practically disappears from fiction into the age of romance and purchases its lack of fidelity and realism. What Cervantes has to say is this: "It is said that in the original of this history, it is read, that when Cid Hamete came to write this chapter, the interpreter translated it not as he had written it, which was a kind of complaint of himself, that he undertook so dry and curious a story, as this of Don Quixote, because it seemed that Don Quixote had wholly his sole eyesores, and that he durst not enlarge himself with other digressions or proper episodes and more delightful; which he said must be have his invention, the horse, and his wallet in the main enterprise, and be upon by the needs of few, and of small importance, and of no benefit to the author; so that to avoid this inconvenience, in the first part he used the art of novels, as of the curious Impertinent, and others of the episodes which are (as it were) separated from the history, though the rest that are there presented, are matters that happened to Don Quixote, which could not nor ought to be set down. He was of opinion, likewise, as he said, that many being carried away with attention to Don Quixote's exploits, would not heed his novels, and pass them, either for haste or inadvertency, without noting the cunning contrivance, and fineness of them, which would be plainly shown, if they might come to light by themselves alone, without Don Quixote's progress or Sancho's simplicities; therefore, in the second part, he would not insert novels, or episodes joining to the story, but certain accidents that might be taken unto them, sprung from the passages that he finds written, and those, too, sparingly, and with words only proper to declare them." [13]

The interest of Cervantes' work is not confined to the fact that, as has been said, they represent the early and powerful opposition to the long-lived form of narrative digression; rather, their interest is perhaps in that they already espouse a defense of our third type of narrative digression-- a life-story told by some one who is not character of a fiction "just happens." For, after all, it is upon the evidence of this form of digression that the anti-digressionists are in general denied a conception of the principle of unity. It behooves us to be accurate in determining their true attitude. Unfortunately, the material directly bearing upon this particular point is scanty. Furthermore, I at once own that what expression exists, is strongely a-

...ainst the epic fictionists. To the other aspect [illegible] of the realists' dis-...ents for unity; the [illegible] of episodes, especially if they are like Cervantes's in-...ert. If of Cervantes, could old Sidney; and Cervantes were here to Calprenede would ...erely be to insist upon a theory of "ecoping unity" which is not realized in the 16th ...entury. [16] But if this Calprenede's unity & Cervantic unity is [illegible] the point. Accordingly, it seems best to leave the matter summed up thus: unity in complexity was theorized upon and carefully distinguished from the structural plan of the chivalric and pastoral romance; unity in "simplicity" was apparently viewed with indifference. [17] Prevost, e.g., seems to say before [illegible] or any digression, if your digressions are not too long. [18] Just what inference this is intended to convey to fictionists of genius would be hard to say.

As to the third type of narrative digression [illegible] it would be folly to expect advice upon the fourth form-- the adventures or "friends" interwoven with those of the main characters. The theory of these interpolated narratives is well put by D'Aubignac in Cervantic terms, [illegible]: "I do not at all doubt that my readers expect here the recital of the entire life of Clarigée, as this is the place where by the order of things it should be, and I only request him [illegible]....in order to avoid the trouble and tediousness of too long a narrative."

Does it now seem to the reader that, amid our admissions and reservations on this or that type of digression, we have skillfully concealed a case which actually condemns the fictionists from [illegible] to make an advance in the direction of unity and coherence of narrative? Let us see. In one aspect [illegible] such a judgment, the fictionists can plead a genuine desire for brevity; details, once invariably included in a story, are omitted as being dull or trite, or are left to the reader's imagination. In another aspect, the fictionists can cite their opposition to edifying, informational, and descriptive digression, and to such narrative digression as is comprised under the "story-insertion" and the "Cervantic novel." The indictment, then, must finally rest upon the refusal of the fictionists to yield their privilege of the personal digression and the narrative digression loosely related to the action of a story.

Accordingly, after giving to the modern judge two cautions relative to the evi-

dence of "narrative licence", we may close the case, and proceed to the question of the minor points of Stevenson's ambiguous fiction. Granting in the first century is for once, it seems to me, less culpable than wrong. In reading that one or that fiction utterly loses unity, the judicious reader too often observes only the number of interruptions, not of intervening, and the prejudiced reader too often the number of digressions, not of interruptions. His decision is based accordingly. Are on the one hand, a tale is frequently broken off and resumed as many as four or five times. All this is but one digression; remote it may sometimes amplify unity is secured. On the other hand, an incident may rarely contain other tales; the tale is then but one magnificent interruption.[29] A quite different matter, --the necessity of examining inserted narrative in the light of the author's professed aim-- may surely be left to the reader's meditation.[30] One instance will suffice. To some volume deliberately chooses the form of a romance that it may be free in its movement (v. p. 111); its purpose is to present the "ideal of a well-ordered life." Of the inserted tales these by Joseph, Nicholas, Silvester, and Apollos are but so many reverting narratives, and need not come under consideration. Even "included" stories' events. Yet, like the artist's tale in the house of the seven gables, the accounts of Philemone and of Jacob's conversion possess a symbolical value in relation to the entire fiction. Alone, then, the relation about Theophrastus is indefensible.[31]

CHAPTER [illegible]

MINOR PROBLEMS OF [illegible]

Were one to ask a modern lecturer upon fiction what topics were comprised under the head of minor problems of structural technique, he would be likely to suggest point of view, the "dramatic composition" of a fiction, methods of relation, types of beginnings and endings, motivation, and such devices as might be employed to secure and maintain the reader's attention. Surely it throws much light upon Richardson and Fielding, when one finds that the pre-Richardsonians discussed all of these topics, save that of "dramatic composition," i.e., the possible resemblance between the plot-structure of fiction and drama.[1]

The reason for this silence in regard to a resemblance between the plot-structure of these two types of literature is not far to seek. It is true that Furetière had maintained that the satirical functions of the novel of manners should emulate those of satirical comedy, that Calprenède had striven to fasten the unities upon heroico-historical romance, and that Congreve had attempted to found a variety of fiction which should have the play of intrigue characteristic of Restoration drama; but neither these writers nor any others seem to have opposed a theory of structure, which was absolutely incompatible with the use of such terms as rising action, turning-point, falling action, moment of last suspense, etc. This theory was the use of "sequels."[2]

Certainly the extent to which sequels were employed before Richardson is amazing. Probably the practice was derived from the romance-cycles; the Amadis, e/g., grew and grew until a mere summary of the adventures of its Amadises, Esplandians, Lisuartes, and Florisels would occupy several thick volumes; as one reads on and on, one is almost tempted to echo the malicious wish of a satirist-- that some great-great-great-grandson of this hardy family would meet the fate of Abelard. The Polexandre, too, not only spread its two earlier volumes into five, but elongated itself into the Cytherée (1642) and the Jeune Alcidiane (1651). But sequels were not confined to the chivalric romances. The Diana had three "parts," and still remains unfinished; Lazarillo de Tormes was hailed from his retirement to become a tunny-fish; Lyly closes Euphues

and his England with the hope that a kind reception may work either a desire in Euphues hereafter if he live, to end it, or a mind in those that are better able to amend it;" Greene remarks after Mamilia, Pt. II: "marry, whether Pharicles proved as inconstant a husband as a faithless wooer, I know not; but if it be my hap to hear, look for news as speedily as may be;" the Court of Venus, though apparently finished, promises "more;" Robinson Crusoe threatens, like Thompson's broom, to go on forever.[3] The small amount of attack upon the sequel merely confirms the weight of all this evidence. As far as I know, Swift alone turned his batteries upon the practice; he will, he says, exhaust his "vein all at a running," since "this I understand for a more generous proceeding, than to turn the company's stomach by inviting them again to-morrow to a scurvy meal of scraps."[4]

The theory of sequels is perhaps a subject of no particular importance at the present time.[5] Not so with our next topic, methods of relating a story. Still novelists continue to choose now the first-person method, now the third-person, now the method which eliminates everything save dialogue, now the method which employs the exchange of letters. Of all of these methods the pre-Richardsonian fiction offers examples. But the dialogue between two or more persons seems to have been too rare to arouse theorizing, and we have already discussed the letter-novel as a type of fiction with a clear and broad theory.[6] And, after all, before 1740 just as now, fictionists were chiefly interested in weighing the comparative advantages of the first and third person ways of telling a tale.

It is by no means surprising that the keen-minded Mlle. de Scudéry should have been the first to investigate this question. Her view is presented in a conversation in Tome III of Clélie (pp. 1376-1384); we can do no better than to play eavesdroppers, and thereafter to analyze the points made and to follow out their implications. We find Amilcar just finished with the relation of his own adventures, which, however, he has narrated as though they were those of one Artexandre, a Greek. The company requests a reason for this passing incognito. "Because," responds Amilcar, "when one follows such an usage, one praises or blames all those of whom one speaks, according to their deserts. One depicts the persons whom one introduces into a narrative; one discourses upon affairs; one mixes his sentiments with theirs; and one makes them speak

and think exactly and entirely that which they have said and thought. But when one tells his history himself, all that one says to his own advantage is suspected of those who listen; and it is so difficult, if it be a woman who makes a narration, to have her say with good grace, I have been the cause of love (j'ai donné de l'amour); or, if it be a man, to make him fittingly recount that he has been loved, or that he is brave, that it is a thousand and a thousand times more reasonable that it should be a third person who narrates, than that he himself recount." To this Aronce objects at once, and in very modern fashion: "there would be others who would find it strange that these third persons should know so many particularities of matters in which they have not the main interest." "No, not at all," retorts Amilcar, for "in addition to one's sometimes knowing better the adventures of others than his own, because one can learn them from the mouth of all the persons interested, it is, besides, true that it is necessary for those who read to enter into the 'sentiments' of him who has made the work, and that they know his mind upon that which he thus uses only to give them more pleasure than they would have, if the matter were otherwise." Aronce is silenced, but Cenésie proposes a new difficulty-- whether or no one should "be eager adroitly to give the key, as you have given that of the history of Artaxandre." This in turn is met by a member of the party; such curiosity on Cenésie's part seems to her inexplicable; "since that would alter nothing either in the adventures or the sentiments, what does it matter whether those between whom the things which please you occur, are Arcons or Africans? And why torment yourself so much to know that which can not give you effective diversion? For me, if Amilcar had said in commencing his narrative, 'I am going to recount to you an adventure which I have invented,' I should have listened quietly and with as much pleasure as I have had. I should have had even more, for I should have been able to admire in him the art of one who would have so happily invented adventures so ingeniously constructed."

Assuredly, neither the direct statements of this important conversation, nor yet its far-reaching implications have failed to echo down the centuries. Over Mlle. de Scudéry's defense of the imagination we may pass; the answer to Cenésie is but a part of Mlle. de Scudéry's theory which we have already examined. But in the first

place, here is the frank recognition that the autobiographic narrative is mainly a tour de force, which embarrasses the conscientious hero or heroine; need one comment that this very criticism has been among the sharpest thrusts made at Henry Esmond? In the second place, here is a clear enumeration of the advantages of the third-person story: the ability impartially to mete out praise and blame; the pleasing necessity of describing accurately all the dramatis personae; the minuteness of analysis permitted to the meditative and omniscient author. One must admit, of course, that in the mention of the first of these advantages Mlle. de Scudéry is repeating a stock claim for the superiority of fiction over history, and that in the presentation of the second she slides over the disadvantages of the long description-- though her enemies long preceded the critics of Scott in discoveries upon this point.[10] Nor, for that matter, does Mlle. de Scudéry sound the perilous deeps of the "advantages" of omniscience. Yet, all deductions made, her signal service to fiction --in this conversation-- remains marked; Aronce is the first person boldly to face the problem of point of view-- our third topic.

At the present time, the problem of point of view in fiction has been fearfully tangled by the Argus-eyed critic; he points the unhappy novelist to an insoluble dilemma, which, stated in plain terms, is this: if omniscience be not granted to the author of a third-person story, the novelist must, perforce, rack his brains to escape inconsistencies; if omniscience be granted to him, he must be careful to select spokesmen from particular groups, or he will appear unnaturally learned.[11] The pre-Richardsonians never got this far in the study of point of view; but all through the 17th century the broader aspects of the problem are touched upon. The effect upon fiction is evident.

If Mlle. de Scudéry's Aronce was the first person boldly to face the question of how much an author may be allowed to know of the actions of his characters, he was not the first to be troubled by the query. It may be recalled that the characters of the Diana had casually raised the question (v. p. XIX); and Nashe, very clumsily, seems to have tried to meet the criticism of some Elizabethan Aronce.[12] After Nashe, the defenders of omniscience for a time fell back upon simple and natural explanations. In the voyage imaginaire, which was mainly autobiographical, the problem was laid to

rest by the convenient formula of I-was-told-it-by-others. Chapelain went a bit further in trying to placate critical readers of heroico-historical romance. "It is impossible," says Araxes, "for me to describe the particularities of this battle; for besides that the tediousness of the relation would weary you, I could not be present in all places."

But neither the mention of obliging informants nor the omission of detail which it was "impossible" to know could buy off the satirists; they ridiculed unsparingly the long inserted narrative, which involved verbatim reproductions of conversations, letters, and poems; the intimate revelations of secrets; and, cruelest blow of all, the agreeable, loquacious, and convenient confidants. Rougeant asks plainly: "how could the authors.... know so exactly the most particular conversations of two lovers, even to the last syllable?" Furetière, earlier, aims several explicit darts at the "useful friend or servant." In the Roman Bourgeois (I, p.85), Lucrèce's seduction, we learn, can not be described, because "by sad chance one knows nothing of all that, since the thing passed secretly." Again, Collantine's opinion of Bellastre's letter is not given, since Collantine has no confidante-- a "very extraordinary"situation, comments Furetière (II, p.280), "for regularly at the reception of such letters there is present some person who observes the words or the movements of the countenance, faithful witnesses to the heart of the lady, and who immediately betrays them." In still another passage Furetière writes: "unhappily for this history, Lucrèce had no confidante and the marquis no squire, to whom they could repeat in proper terms their most secluded conversations. This is a thing never lacking to heroes and heroines."

Naturally, in the face of such recurrent attacks, the novelists who, it will be remembered, were ever striving after plausibility, were driven both to newer explanations and to more frequent repetition of old ones. In, e.g., the first tome of Clélie (1654), one weak defense runs thus: "if my memory does not fail me;" another, somewhat better, is(p.344): "I can show you a copy of it." The memory-device is further strengthened in Télémaque (187): "I have repeated to you the very words of Ulysses, because to me they have been repeated so often, that they perpetually recur to my mind; and I frequently repeat them to myself." But of all the effects of the assault, the most significant result was the slow advance toward the disappearance of the confidant.

"were one," remarks Honorius in the Description of Europe in the Close of the 17th Century (p. 311), "to know all the circumstances of their amour, it could not be unentertaining ....I happened upon some that were confidents to 'em, and therefore go along with public reports and open matter of fact." We have already observed (p. 115-16) how the union of the desire to be lascivious and the wish to be vraisemblable brought about the peculiar form of the English 18th century chronique scandaleuse and even gave birth to the novel of inanimate objects. Shall we be far wrong in seeing a second source for these forms of fiction in the quarrels about point of view?

In one sense the whole problem of point of view is, as we have seen, a phase of a larger question-- that of methods of relation; similarly bound up with this larger subject is the problem of proper ways of beginning and ending fictions. This is our fourth topic.[17]

Even now types of beginning in fiction may be reduced to four-- the opening with dialogue, the genealogical opening, the discursive opening, and the so-called in medias res opening. But previous to 1740 the opening with dialogue is so rare that it seems to have aroused no comment.[18] On the other hand, the remaining openings tended both in practice and theory to ally themselves with special types of fiction. Typical examples of the three common forms of beginning are to be found in the first lines of the Theagenes and Chariclea, the Lazarillo de Tormes, and the Marianne. The Theagenes invites the peruser to look at a band of pirates, themselves gazing from a hill toward a sea-coast, where amid the wreckage of a vessel hero and heroine sit lamenting. The Lazarillo presents the distinct need of explaining the hero's parentage. The Marianne, after a passage, which is really a preface concerning the finding of a ms., plunges into a monologue by Marianne on the definition of"style."

The abrupt opening exemplified in the Theagenes was preferred during the 17th and early 18th centuries by the authors of an occasional novel of manners or psychological-historical novel; but its true love was the romance. For all types of this form of fiction, save the early chivalric, adhere to the opening in medias res. Thus the Cassandra introduces one to Strephon and Claius lamenting for Erania, the Argenis to a mysterious stranger just disembarked in Sicily, the Endymion to villagers bewailing an eclipse of the moon near Mount Latmos, the Nova Solyma to a couple of tra-

veliers ascending the hill to the New Jerusalem, the Cassandre to a melancholy knight outside of Babylon. The theory of this opening first appears, I think, in the satire of Sorel. Again, however, it was the cautious Mlle. de Scudéry, who formulated for romance a law which has never lost its power. Partly the great Precheuse relied upon the precedent of Greece, for she writes before Ibrahim: "The geniuses of antiquity have not done like those painters, who present in one and the same cloth a prince in the cradle; upon the throne, and in the tomb, perplexing, by this so little judicious a confusion, him that considers their work; but with an incomparable address they begin their history in the middle, so as to give some suspense to the reader, even fro the first opening." Partly, also, Mlle/ de Scudéry evolved her surprising beginnings out of her theory that a romancer may deal only with striking historical events, which take the reader by surprise and hold his interest suspended from page to page. Her words have been quoted (v. p. 89). Yet it is not amiss to recall Clélie with its frightful and vivid earthquake, Ibrahim with its gorgeous procession in Constantinople, Artamène with its midnight burning of Sinope, Almahide with its civil uproar in the streets of Granada.

Clear as Mlle. de Scudéry's words are, they do not express the full 17th century theory of the in medias res opening. For this we must turn back to the remarks of Sorel in the Berger extravagant (1627); he distinguishes two forms of this beginning, one such as that employed by the romancers whose work has lasted, and the other an opening which is veritably in vacuo. Sorel's ideas are most evident in a conversation between the Quixotic shepherd, Lysis, and Clarimond, a tormenting friend of the hero who has promised to write the latter's history." Clarimond has begun the biography and reads the first lines (213): "Under the happy reign of the most invincible king of the Fleurdeluces, there flourished at Paris the son of a silkman, whose virtue paralleled the antiquity of his race, and whose antiquity of race was far below his riches." In haste Lysis interrupts, objecting that "martyrologies" begin thus, and adding: "My history must begin in the middle, that's the way of all your famous romances; a man must enter by degrees into the body of the history, and not discover the design to the reader unto the very last." "I should," it seems, returns Clarimond,

"in the beginning have mentioned that when Clarit and understood by Lysis's letters the extreme affection he bore to her, her mind was charged with sundry imaginations, or some such thing. After I had a while pursued the narration, I should bring my shepherd to Anselmo's, to whom he should relate his first adventures.... Yet 'tis a pretty impertinence to bring in this man or that man, without telling the reader who they were, or naming the country where the things related were done." Even in Theagenes and Chariclea, he continues, the time, persons, and places are mentioned; no such phrase is used as "Chariclea knew not as yet whether Theagenes were alive or dead, when she fell among a company of robbers." And had such a phrase been used, "would it not have been thought that this were the second book?" [14] The gist of the matter is finally put: "'tis then to be thought that there is certainly some grace to begin a romance in the middle, but it must be done with such artifice that that middle may seem to be the true beginning." [23]

The genealogical opening so displeasing to Lysis was not limited to martyrologies; the early chivalric romance, some of the voyages imaginaires, many of the psychological-historical novels, and nearly all the picaresque tales clung to it. That it was practically a law of the Amadisian romance is clear from the satire of Rougemont's Prince Pan-foredin: "According to the general custom, I should begin this history with the particulars of my birth.... I shall omit this detail and every other circumstance foreign to my subject;" that it was found in very influential historical novels is manifest from Ame. D'Aulnoy's Hippolite (1690), the first nineteen pages of which are devoted to the parents of Julie, the heroine; [1] and that it was present in the voyage imaginaire is seen in Robinson Crusoe. Nowhere, however, does this type of opening seem to have been felt so obligatory as in the picaresque tale; its use may be attributed to a mixture of desires-- production of a beginning analogous to that of a serious biography, parodying of the commencement of the chivalric romance, aiding of the effort to force the reader's belief, conscious search for the double entendre. Already in 1599 Aleman feels the power of the tradition so strongly that he makes Guzman d'Alfarache exclaim: "I was so impatient to relate my own adventures to you, that I had nearly commenced without making any mention of my family. This would certainly

have brought upon me the reproaches of some cavilling dialecticus. 'Let us not go so fast, friend Guzman,' he would have said, 'let us begin, if you please, with the definition before we arrive at the defined. Inform us, in the first place, what were your parents." And from this date until 1672 there seem to have been few revolts from the theory. Arceo's Hortunes of Savilla, Quevedo's Sueño del Infierno, La Hi-cara Justina, the English Rogue, all open regularly. Francion, it is true, plunges in medias res, and the Garduña de Sevilla opens with three pages of comparison between the heroine and a pole-cat; but Doña Rufina speedily reverts to the matter of ancestry, and, when Francion comes to relate his escapades to an acquaintance, he apologizes for not referring to his origin. Alone, as far as I know, stands Vincente's Marcos de Obregon (1618).

After 1672, however, there is a marked effort to escape the old arrangement. Hirsemann writes thus, before the Soluez Militez, published in that year: "I shall not (as is usual in books of this nature, viz., Guzman, Lazarillo de Tormes, or our late English Rogue) give you any account of the circumstances of my parents." Defoe, too, says in Captain Avery (p.4): "In the present account, I have taken no notice of my birth, infancy, youth, or any of that part; which, as it was the least useless part of my years to myself, so 'tis the most useless to any that shall read this work to know, being altogether barren of anything remarkable in itself or interesting to others." Nevertheless, the genealogical opening is often in evidence. In France the tradition is followed in Le Lisa and (though rather mysteriously) in Sorisnat; and in England it is voiced before Defoe's Captain Singleton: "As it is usual for great persons whose lives have been remarkable.... to insist much upon their originals.... that I may be methodical, I shall do the same."

The genealogical opening, then, and that in mediis rebus were supposed to be especially proper, the former to the picaresque tale, the latter to the romance. Thereremaining popular beginning, the discursive, held sway over the historical-pseudo-historical novel, the novel of manners, and the chronique scandaleuse. The first of these forms favored historical sketches as a beginning, the second personal scintillations, the third piquant sermonettes. Still, the term discursive is not so easily to be limited; it must be made to cover remarks on comedy , in the first paragraph of the Francion,

a declaration of personal knowledge from the author of Oroonoko, the story of the genesis of Pilgrim's Progress, the intimate revelations of the first lines of Les Aventures de ...., the mammoth description of the "shell-boat" in Gotheree, etc. Now, on the whole, does this type of opening arouse much comment of value. All that theorizing upon it does is to point out the change in fashion from time to time. The difference, e.g., between the discursive opening common in 1661 and that patronized in 1711 is interestingly shown in the satirical beginnings of two novels of manners. In the first pages of de Visu's Fragments d'une Histoire Comique (1621), we read: "The accustomed elegance of our writers is more according to these terms: 'The dawn, all gold and azure, edged with pearls and with rubies, appeared at the gates of the east; the stars, dazzled by a livelier brightness, began to efface their whiteness and became little by little of the color of the sky; the beasts of the chase returned to the woods and men to their work; silence gave place to noise and darkness to light.' And all the rest that the vanity of scribblers makes blaze forth by favor of public ignorance." Almost a century later the author of the Generous Rivals declares: "I shall not trouble you with the splendid titles of our heroine's ancestors; nor attempt to recount the several marks of dignity in their scutcheons; but content myself with acquainting you, that both her father and mother were of a genteel extract, and made it their continued study, whilst they lived, to qualify their daughter, to keep up to the character. It were needless also to amuse you with a recital of the indulgent affection her father bore her; and the various impulsive forebodings her mother had of her being to act some extraordinary part; with soundness of other such curious remarks which are generally made, the better to grace an introduction of this kind."

So much for types of beginning in fiction-- the in medias res opening, the genealogical, and the discursive. Were writers so delightfully regular as to attach to the two main forms of beginning corresponding endings, one might expect to find comments upon this latter subject, dealing, on the one hand, with abrupt disappearance of the characters, and, on the other, with funerals and epitaphs. Indeed, if marriage may be interpreted as abrupt disappearance from the field of action, one finds before 1740 examples of both these endings. Theory, however, concerns itself only with poetic justice --reward for the good, punishment for the bad-- and with what may be called

a "real-life" ending.

As late as our pessimistic age reward for the good in fiction is likely to be marriage; before 1740 it was almost always so. Probably the theory of this type of ending is related to such Renaissance tenets as Tristino's upon a "happy ending" for the virtuous both in tragedy and comedy; yet it undoubtedly is also an inheritance from the chivalric romance and the Greek novel, and is certainly affected by the loving refusal of author-creators to destroy the bliss of their literary offspring. In any event, a vague enunciation of the doctrine is heard as early as Greene's Menaphon (1589), and from that time to its voicing in Crowne's Pandion and Amphigeneia (1665) as a "vulgar rule," the convention of an ending in marriage dominated both romantic and realistic fiction. Even in 1734, when, as we shall see, there had risen and fallen a whole school of writers opposed to this ending, Lenglet-Dufresnoy writes in the De-guise des Romans (Vol.II,p.31): "these romans which have a mysterious end leave always a sort of sadness after their reading. Long live those which finish only with joy." Marriage, furthermore, was not allotted merely to hero and heroine, but to all their worthy friends. Sometimes the haste to wed startles the reader, as in Greene's Menaphon (145-146), where, "lest there should be left anything imperfect in this pastoral accident, Doron sendes himself vp and iumped a marriage with his old friend Carmela." At times, too, the reader wonders if economy was perhaps considered; at least we read in Lysander and Callista (1617): "By this means the marriages were resolved to be in one day finished between Alcidon and Argire, Acidon and Olinde, Lucidan and Hippolita, Leontius and Amarisia, and brave Lysander and Callista." More than once, finally, he is asked to imagine the ceremonies, as, e.g., in Pandion and Amphigeneia (p.307): "having thus led my hero through all difficulties.... it may be expected.... I should have placed him in the arms of his beloved Amphigeneia. But.... I esteem audition a more tolerable and masculine distraction than love....Possibly I may be also thought too hard-hearted in leaving my other lovers succourless in their miseries.... But the vulgar rule of romance may salve all, 'That the knight must kill the giant and get the lady.'"

Satire, of course, hurried to speed its shafts against this group marriage. But Sorel, at least, got no further than assault upon the oddities of this well-establish-

ed convention. Thus Lysis complains, bruitingly enough, "since all the world is resolved to be married here, without staying till I marry, to make a fair conclusion of all amorous adventures, why are you not all married together....according to the mode.... on the same day and in the same place;" and Clarimond replies: "ne voudriez-vous pas qu'ils dorment dans la même lit." Yet, as is evident in this very passage, the Lysis closes with several marriages, and in the L'Eglise de Chrysante Doral says (p.1064): " all those who were married at Cyprus on the same day.... have had similar felicity." The important views of Furetière and Lenoble are not necessarily satirical, and will be considered later.

If the reward for the virtuous was one side of poetic justice, the reverse was lamentation of the wicked. Again one may, if one please, derive the theory from the Renaissance perversions of Aristotelian dicta. Several facts remain: in the chivalric romance, though passionate abandon may go unscathed, cowardice and disloyalty never do; in the Greek novel, "love service" and her kin, male and female, meet summary destruction; and, above all, the average author-creator desires to display a righteous power over his own little Sodom and Gomorrah. Certainly zeal for the punishment of the ungodly is seen everywhere in fiction before 1740. Margaret Newcastle, forgetting that numbers of innocents have perished in a "tragic war" of her claiming, World (1668), writes before this book: "I have destroyed but some few men in a little boat, which died through the extremity of cold, and that by the hand of justice, which was necessitated to punish their crime of stealing away a young and beauteous lady." Calprenède, whose difficulties in the adjustment of historical "fact" and poetic justice have already been described (v.p. 83), wishes in Cassandre (p.555) "to change the conditions of so many persons, whom prosperity, or the adversity of their affairs, had unjustly humbled or exalted." Accordingly, Perdiccas (562) is "slain in that same town where he had unworthily abused his power, and by the hands of that same enemy whose death he [illegible] a few moments before had attempted with so much injustice and inhumanity;" and it is a "marvellous effect of justice" that deceitful Arbates dies by the hand of Cassander, "his master's most implacable enemy" (5.5). Before, too, emphasizes in Moll Flanders "this fundamental," as a law to be "strictly adhered to; there is not a wicked action in any part of it, but is first or last rendered unhappy and unfortu-

nate; there is not a superstitive villain brought upon the stage, but either he is brought to an unhappy end or brought to be a penitent.'

Despite the extraordinary influence of both phases of poetic justice upon the theory of fiction before Libertinism, it would be unfair to suppose that the 'real-life' ending had not been speculated upon. On this point, however, one must be cautious. Two apparent exceptions to the theory of poetic justice used by these authors consistently brought under that theory; there are the gay adventures of picaresque heroes and the sad fates of the heroines of a school of renunciation. The allegiance, honest and otherwise, of some picaresque authors to the ending in which the rogue repents, is declared to solve even what the modern reader finds a sad inconsistency-- the earthly prosperity of a picaro; further, violations of the law of repentance is accounted for by what the author intended to do with his picaro, and what some "socializer" prevented his effecting! But the picaros and their creators have been fully discussed (v. p. 23). The heroines of the school of renunciation are not so easily dismissed. Before 1740 there are two schools wherein heroines renounce their lovers (occasionally vice versa); that of Boccaccio's Fiammetta, extending from the Spanish imitations of 1490 seq. to the appearance of the chaste heroine in France in about 1690; and that of the Princesse de Cleves, reaching from 1670 to far into the 18th century. It seems to the modern reader that the first of these schools can not be subserving poetic justice; the renunciation of a lover (almost always to an adulterous married woman) is forced by the treachery of the paramour, and is greeted with bitter outcries against fate. Nevertheless, the theory said to underlie these narratives is that the heroines are punished for unfaithfulness and are intended to stand as terrible warnings. More complex still is the problem of the adherence of the authors of the later school to poetic justice. The Princesse de Cleves may be thought of at the present time as a mere analytical study in a woman's heart, or, on the other hand, as the manoeuvring of a fatal secret. The theory behind it is unstated. This much is illuminating, however. For the long stretch of imitations of the Princesse de Cleves and the Portugese Letters, the preface to Mlle. Bernard's Eléonor d'Yvrée (1687) is representative; the authoress says: "Nevertheless I have believed....that readers could draw another sort of utility.... I conceive so much disturbance (déréglement) in love.... that I have

thought it would be of more value to present to the public a picture of the misfortunes of that passion than to see lovers, virtuous and delicate, happy at the end of the book. I put my heroes then in a situation so sad, that one can not at all envy them."[37] Accordingly, that to us the death of the hapless Comtesse de Devonshire is not poetic justice, but cruel tragedy, is no reason for seeing in the school to which this work belongs deliberate studies of real-life endings.

Whatever the practice, then, the theory of real-life endings must be confined to the utterances of a few authors consciously opposing current views upon the conventional methods of ending.[38] Of such authors Furetière and Renoble may stand as exponents. The doll-like heroine of the Roman bourgeois, it is true, flees to a distant castle with her précieux lover; but Collantine and Charroselles seek divorce almost immediately after marriage, and the scheming Lucrèce, in place of being branded with her scarlet sin, is allowed to deceive all the world into believing that she is the most pious of devotees. Furetière's manifesto is this. "Do not expect that I reserve all my characters for marriage at the end of the book, where one ordinarily sees as many weddings celebrated as at a carnival, because there will perhaps be some who, after having made love, would prefer to live in celibacy, and others will get married clandestinely and without you or me knowing anything of it." Renoble's words are these before Ildegerte (1681): "I know that there will be those who will find it censurable that a marriage takes place in the midst of a novel. But I reply to them that I write history and not fiction, that if I had wished to make a novel, I could not have made Ildegerte and made her do as a lover (amante) all that she has done married." The completion of Marivaux's Marianne carries us beyond 1740 to 1742; but the ending of the story is too suggestive of some of the lesser currents of 18th century fiction not to be added here: "Were I writing a novel or romance, I should, perhaps, according to custom, have left off at our marriage, since all the pleasing scenes, which arise from tender distress, are supposed there to have an end. The professed enemies of that state, indeed, will tell you, that however desirable it may appear at a distance, a husband and wife are the most flat and insipid creatures, when together, of any in the universe.... But believe me....this is mere common-place declamation, and has not one word of truth in it."[40]

In the consideration of such minor problems of technique as we have thus far discussed-- the use of sequels, methods of exhibition, point of view, types of beginning and ending, it has often been difficult to refrain from repetition or matter in earlier chapters. With the remaining questions of technique-- motivation, devices for securing interest, ways of transition, this difficulty increases.

Motivation is usually rather an indefinite term. It may be as inclusive as that field of vraisemblance which deals with "probability," and in this case there fall within its scope Cervantes's scorn for the supernatural (v/ p.42), Lope's sneers at the improbabilities of the pastoral romance (p.70), the final turning of Mlle. de Scudéry to the "gallant" chevaliers of Granada (p.94), Defoe's and Swift's efforts to be accurate in minute detail-- indeed, so many topics previously treated that one hesitates to enumerate them further. Motivation, however, has also a more limited definition, according to which it is the specific ordering of one event in such a way that a succeeding event appears naturally to arise from the earlier. But even in this restricted sense, motivation has been incidentally examined. Cases in point are Mlle. de Scudéry's revision of the Cassio legend (p.57), the introduction of the "unhappy love affair" into the 17th century voyage imaginaire (p.111), Moscherosch's wish to trace with relentless accuracy the decay of a soul (p.110), etc. Surely one need add here no more than two instances, as will suffice. Defoe in the preface to his King of Pirates writes: "It has been enough to the writers of this man's life, as they call it, that they could put together in such a kind of monstrous unheard-of story....all which are as much true as his being master of so many millions of money which he nor his gang never had, one of his being proclaimed King of Madagascar, marrying the Mogul's daughter, and the like. And, by-the-bye, it was but ill laid together of those who published, that he first ravished her, then murdered her, and then married her....this story (has been) stripped of all the romantic, improbable, and impossible parts..." In 1725 Defoe in the preface to the second edition of his Travels of Cyrus (1727) gives still stronger testimony to the power of this principle of motivation. Before the first edition of his work he had said this, since he was producing a "philosophical history" and not a romance, "unity of action" was "by no means necessary;" before the second edition he points out numerous alterations, near-

ly all in the direction of extending considerations. Thus, e.g., Prévost's journey to Amsterdam is in no longer the case of necessity. Cleveland is sent by Oxtagrave to the Magi in order that the boy's adolescent [illegible] may be urged upon him.

If from motivation we turn to the devices for [illegible] the reader's interest, we are still on ground we have trod. Lenglet-Dufresnoy's [illegible] outfit of "tricks" mystery, suspense, surprise, [illegible], [illegible], foreshadowing. Of these devices the first three have been noted [illegible] as essential to the theories of Mlle. de Scudéry (v. p.31), Courtilz (iii), Anglus (iii), and others; but nowhere is that stock in trade better set forth than in the preface to Prévost's translation of Pericles and Sharicles (1739). Prévost declares: "The arrangement is peculiar: for it commences in the midst of its story--- which causes at first great wonder to the readers and engenders in them a passionate desire of learning the beginning; and nevertheless, to leave them so well through the ingenious weaving (liaison) of his story, that one is not at all worried [illegible] when one first arrives at the commencement of the first book to find that it is at the end of the tale. And when one has arrived there, one has yet another desire to see the beginning; in such fashion that always the curiosity is [illegible] until the reader comes to the conclusion, which leaves his spirits." Yet the remainder [illegible] is less plentiful. Foreshadowing, always an [illegible], positive and ambitious, is frequently employed. But, as far as I know, never analyzed. Surprise is [illegible] as an essential feature of [illegible] romance novel (v. p.4); otherwise, comments upon it are limited to its value in characterization. Finally, the various kinds of coincidence are clearly [illegible] in its satirical stress upon romance (p.73); yet a passage from Lysimon and Alcidiane (1677) in verse makes (p.58): "No man could have believed that two friends, like the Lion and Fire whose countries had diverse ways and desires to fight, and contrary one with the other, should meet in one time, in a place so remote from their affairs, and in habits so different for their conditions."

Transition is our last topic. As was said at the opening of Cr. VII, after 1679

methods of transition were no longer related to the struggle toward unity; rather, by becoming less obtrusive than in the days of chivalric romance, they aimed at the reader's unconscious acquiescence. It is true that the old formulae flourished until about 1660, and that, even to the present day, they survive in their crudest forms. By the time of the Jorge Latreyenne, however, the natural quest of fictionists was for ease in transition from one scene to another. And in this regard, the translator of Gerel, was able to write in reference to a 'let us return' in the tale of Montomay, that it is/ VII of the Jorge Latreyenne as a burlesque upon the chivalric romance: "But where it is said that 'In the meantime [illegible], to whom it is now time to return'.... 'tis a manner of speaking very frequent in our romances. There's no artifice in this, and 'tis to suggest the reader of a very weak memory, and betrays the author's weakness, that can not foster things very handsomely together." After all, a return the downfall of the formal transition was inevitable.[1]

Our survey of pre-Richardsonian theorizing upon the minor problems of structural technique in fiction is at an end. It is well to note succinctly what was known to these early writers. On what is at present called the "dramatic composition" of fiction there was practically no comment; belief in sequels was too prevalent to permit such an analogy. On the other hand, methods of relation, and in particular, the advantages of third-person narrative, had been comparatively discussed. Consideration of point of view had brought down satire upon the long-winded "inclusive tale", and had threatened the confidant with extermination. Types of beginning for certain forms of fiction, especially the romance and the picaresque tale, had become conventionalized. Poetic justice had been criticized and the real-life ending had begun to appear. Motivation had become a principle to be taken into account, even by species of fiction striving against the law of coherence. Practically all the "modern tricks" for holding the reader's attention had been characterized. Transition had passed from the domains of unity to those of narrative-flavour. Surely, if it be admitted that what can be claimed to-day is but a small part of what was written theorizing before 1700, it becomes necessary to restate the place of criticism and elaboration in the development of the theory of fiction.

APPENDIX A

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1

The actual amount of influence is not germane to the present discussion. The Greek novel, nevertheless, since its influence is not well-known, requires comment. The *Ephesiaca* of Xenophon of Ephesus is given in a catalogue of books of the abbey of St. Germain in Germany in 707. The *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius was translated into French by Arnyot (1547) and into English by Underdowne (1566?; licensed 1566); while his *Eros and Psyche* into French by Arnyot (1550) was into English by Adlington (1566?); Achilles Tatius' *Clitophon and Leucippe* into French (1575) was into English (1638); Parthenius of Nicaea's *Erotica* into French (1600?; *Amours de Parthenie*) into French (1676). These are all first translations; for later numerous printings, vol. I, ch. 4, and Appendix, pp.7-14, may be consulted. Heliodorus' *Theagenes and Chariclea* had the largest influence of the Greek novel, via Boccaccio's *Filocolo*. The *Filocolo* was in English by 1567, French by 1584, English a. 1587; and a direct continuation of the work, the *Erotic Narrative* by Parthenius by Gomez de Flores (1530), was in French by 1536. Powerfully influenced by both Boccaccio and Heliodorus was Jacques de Vintimille du Chastel's *Le Premier Volume des Memoires* (1604), as well as other works (v. Appendix). But most of the *Filocolo* itself is by many hands and is an older representative of the almost complete assimilation of the sentimental characteristics of the Greek novel (v. for that matter, pp. 106-7) than Greek influence. Moreover, Boccaccio could read Greek, and knew that one of the novels of the Decameron is Greek in origin (v. especially the *Filocolo* and *Ephesiaca*, Day 7, novella 1, with its relevance to a Cyprian history). Apart from the *Filocolo*, finally, there are other proofs of Greek influence. Farrer (p.31) remarks on "undoubted Greek origin" the romances of Perse (1616), of Pierre Le Loyer and Alexandre Fleur. The Spanish *Selva de Aventuras* (1565) is closely parallel to Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius. Other direct imitations were much forgotten as the result of Urfé's *L'Astrée*, which for a hundred years passed current. In the 17th century the Argenis and the Astrée were thoroughly fashionable; the investigations in regard to the *Histoire Véritable* of Lucian (1596-1677) find Greek influence predominant. V.

ance by cl. v.

The source of this interesting start of love-and-adventure has been variously sought. Rust (1677) finds it in an oriental influence, left unidentified. Dunlop (1814) apparently traces it to the Alexius legend, understood --wrongly-- by the analogy of the 16 abstracts of "elegiac" subjects, attributed to Parthenius of Nicaea: Villemain (Essai sur les romans grecs, 1834) sees in it an offshoot of late Greek comedy; Chassang (Les romans grecs, 1862) attributes it to native lust for tale-telling. Much more critical are Schmid (1876) and Barwick (1938). Rohde follows in extreme detail, first the transformation of the Greek elegy into a long poem, still elegiac in tone, but with inserted tales, heavily expressing sentimental love, and then the elevation of these tales into separate novels, having all the erotic characteristics of the later novels. Next, he traces the development of the voyage imaginaire, tracing back for such oriental sea-voyages as the Odyssey and for the Greek Utopias their remote source in Plato's Timaeus. Culmination of the sentimental poem he finds in versions of the Paris-Oenone story (pp. 110-130); our instance of the voyage imaginaire in the sea-voyage of Semiramis, as left to us in an epitome by Diodorus Siculus (v. Vogel's ed. of Diodorus, Vol. II, pp. 55-60). The union of sentimental love and adventure is first (?) seen in Antonius Diogenes's Of the Wonders Beyond Thule, written (?) under Nero in the 1st century. (V. for the summary --all that is left us-- Photius's edition of Photius's Bibliothek, pp. 109-112). Following this were Lucian's Ionica (100-150), Xenophon's Ephesiaca and Anthia (c. 400-450), the Metamorphoses of Tyre (c.250-300), Heliodorus's Theagenes and Charikleia (c. 400), Petron's Satyrikon and Encheiridion (450-500), Chariton's Chaireas and Kallirrhoe (450-500), Longus's Daphnis and Chloe (5th century), and Eustathius's Hysmine and Hysminias (12th century). Byzantine imitations in verse are (12th century) Prodromus's Rhodanthe and Dosikles, Nicetas's Drosilla and Charikles and Manasses's Aristander and Kallithea. Rohde's definition of the Greek novel is the best we know; he says (183-183): Der regelmässige Verlauf ihrer Geschichten ist dieser: Jene Liebenden sind fürstlicher, noch häufiger reicher

sein ins Reine zeichnen, durch mehrere Exemplare zur Sicherheit gelangen, zu lesen und zwar wiederholentlich, und nach mancherley Prüfungen jener Texte und Vergleichungen endlich zu einer Vorstellung dieses Werkes zu gelangen.

Herrig's account of the Greek novel is more simple than Dunlop's. Dependent upon Huet's treatise, the historical romance, unnoticed since Lyly's day, Herrig elaborates upon a first account of the Greek novel from the heroic romance, maintaining the theory of the relation of the Amadis de Gaul to the Greek heroic romances. Viewed closely, however, Herrig's statement in his preface like his theories regarding the development of the Greek romances are not free from "Dunlopismus" in somewhat extraordinary fashion. For Herrig explains the Amadis as a restatement of the roman d'aventure, this in turn being a child of, on the one hand, the chanson d'histoire, the epic-epic part of the Greek romance, which proceeds to us as adventure, or an episode of love, pure and simple (37), and, on the other, of the narrative lai. As far as I can see, this genealogical table corresponds in its most important particular --the source of the erotic element in the Amadis-- with Dunlop's details concerning the influence of the lais upon the Greek novel. And it is upon the anomaly of the two statements that Herrig's inaccuracy (cf. p. 38) rests. The chief problem, I venture to suggest, is still open. Herrig forces his reconstruction of the Greek romance further. Dunlop's proofs, as given in Amadis first-hand, rest upon fragments of proofs. Any three real or lost Greek romances, neither the Aethiopica nor Theagenes and Chariclea, nor the Greek novel, nor the Amadis itself, not in Greece at all, Alexandria, yet these romances (especially the earliest which have survived. At least Herrig's chapter on Egyptian tales (Beziehungen zu den Lais, ch. III) causes any to speculate. And if Perret (v. Reeve's Progress of Romance, 1785) is correct, that of this story

I append the most significant pages for Dunlop's theory in the two editions: 70-71; 71-72; 117-118; 143-[illegible]; [illegible], note 1; [illegible], note 1; 84.

3

These were both portions of romance-cycles; yet they may be considered separately. The three have been chosen, not only because they represent differing

groups, but because servantes (see quiete, ch. 71) spared them from the [illegible] locusts. The source of the Amadis is sought in Warren. He sees little or no Greek influence (p.64), Graves (130) a striking comparison between the story of Amadis and the original four books of the Amadis, and points (131) to a poem (circ. 1335) by Jofre Foixà on the same subject as the Vilamnejico in the Amadis, ed. H, p. 1.

4

Thus the Amadis became much more to the public than a romance. In fact, e. g., Lenoir Rijaun published at Lyons a 500-page volume, Les Thresors et livres d'Amadis des Gaules: les tournoys, fonctions, faicts, combatz, et autres choses les plus excellentes. There were many editions.

5

Written on the title-page of a copy of Munday's translation of 1588) in the Harvard Library. Boutière refers particularly to the author's estimate of women. The time of the Spanish Amadis became more evident in the translation into French by Herberay (1540). He states so in his preface.

6

"Orphans [illegible] strict attention only in the later years of the Renaissance" (Warren, p.224). It is noteworthy that Lyget and Lope (paraphrasing Lyot) expunged the more offensive features of the Greek original.

7

It seems fairly clear that the pastorals of Boccaccio and Sannazaro were written partly as valid histories and partly for the sake of the scholar they contain. The prose is incidental during much of the Ameto and over a third of the Arcadia. The fact that both masterpieces are literary exercises is well-known, but no one has, I think, pointed out a singular proof in the Arcadia (p.113): "especially recalling the pleasures of my charming country, where these solitudes of Arcadia, where not only the sea as risked in noble cities, and scarcely do I believe the savage beasts did dwell with any delight." Presently this is an echo of the original idea of Arcadia; cf. Polyphilo, bk. IV of Colonna-Pompeati's ed., Venice, 1546, pp.161-162,: "Et nation [illegible] di Arcadi regnare e nacque in una certa parte di Morea, non solo per la fertilità del costumi et temperatia di natura, et [illegible]

pon it [illegible] vi rivermano verso sui sui.....[illegible] cii reali sui. i [illegible]
ua, rinci it sui' ch ivi s'avviavano [illegible] i sui [illegible]
.....rinsieme tutt in viti ivi i sposava in sui [illegible], non tante che si
diittassero d'oiro le conversa, [illegible] [illegible]....e
cui cosa i ne vermanti [illegible] che sinco sitte [illegible]
oro, [illegible] i [illegible]. [illegible]
si cusia [illegible] [illegible], [illegible]; [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible], [illegible]
..... [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
ferce it sun, [illegible] [illegible]

Contemporale [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] by [illegible] and by [illegible], was [illegible] by A. Farl in 1880. Farrer (pp. [illegible]) presents a not altogether convincing argument for the rise of the prose pastoral in Spain with little or no influence from Italy. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] (1487), a mere containing satire by Mosquera, a set of dramatic [illegible] by Juan de la Encina (1497), three poems by Garcilaso de la Vega, early in the 16th century, the [illegible] of the [illegible] (1527-1535), and, finally, the prose [illegible] of Montemayor (1554). Yet in regard to de la Vega, Mr. Trueblood [illegible], [illegible] to say that the story of Nemoroso is found in practically the same form in the [illegible].

The [illegible] is also [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

Yet v. the [illegible] in the fifth novel of Ley II of the [illegible]. The [illegible] of Primaleón at the close of the eighth novel of Ley I is the only notable instance of [illegible]. The [illegible] of Ley I and II suggest the Jest-book. Bondello [illegible], while [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] rather clumsy narrators. Still, neither [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] of Ivar, the [illegible], [illegible] [illegible]

accruing of its end. Other antisystems are mentioned in chapter.

12
Explained as the [illegible] by Berti (1957).

13
Carrera (p.204) views the picaresque tale as being under the "pretext of social unrest." This certainly does not [illegible] which dance in the translation calls the first novel of manners," nor yet to the golden Age. The reunion of [illegible] to the "gay and legal" opera or plays is not fairly established. Until some investigator shall rise to pretend to chapter in studying the pronunciation of d'Urfé, Carrera's assumption that between [illegible] and [illegible] is not stressed is an assumption grossly true.

14
In note 1 to ch. 1 I have mentioned the influence of the [illegible] traces by Regnier. The selection seems to have been well-known abroad (fr. 1627) and is perhaps to be identified with G. Perez's [illegible] the hair-- a work I can learn nothing of. In any event, Ayala translated the work in 1641. The [illegible] or Diego de Mendoza appeared in French in 1578 and in English 1578 (cf. Heiserman); other works which expound the popularity of erotica are Lozano's [illegible] (1616; fr.1616; Eng.1657) and Juan de Flores's [illegible] (1469; fr.1526; Eng.1657). Regnier should be consulted for further detail. I quote his remarks on Amadis (p.83) of the Italian and Spanish attitude toward love in the "psychological" novel "pour Italy expressing the beauty of the grand passion, making it the end of life, elevating it above love and formal conventions, enveloping it with an atmosphere of tragic seriousness; pious Spain painting in sombre colors the dawn of all human tenderness, making love a martyrdom, exalting sacrifice, surrounding the woman with a respectful devotion, and, in order that she might be worthy of such a cult, surrounding her with a mystic far-extending and delicate." I add from Guillemme le Breton's [illegible] quotes what I feel is the specific French note in this movement. The heroine's lover, a page from the lower classes and almost contemptuous of the woman's passion, designedly treads with soiled boots upon the magnificant dress of the lady. Though

secretly grieves at the insult, the heroine declares that she would gladly have "kissed where his feet had touched" (p.108). It is of significance, too, I think, that brutality in vengeance scenes Spanish and Italian early fiction. Cf. the tale of a scholar's revenge (Decameron, Day VIII, novella 7), and the flogging of Arsenio in the Heptameron d'Amour (quoted by Regnier, p. 34).

15

The influences of the old we are studying have, I think, all been suggested. The Serapetum and Centurial of Silvestris (1057 seq.), the satires of Petronius, and the Cyropaedia of Xenophon might be added as further qualifications.

16

That this should be so is not strange; it might be inferred from Spingarn's determination of the essential renaissance problem as the "justification of imaginative literature"--i.e., of poetry, for all these critics ignore prose fiction, just as the Greeks (v. Lodge, p.126) had ignored it. Yet since from time to time an effort will be made to compare the theory of prose fiction with that of drama and epic, and since for some of the renaissance critics prose fiction was included under poetry (Varchi and Minturno vs. Castelvetro and Harington, e.g.), the purposed reasons to justify poetry may be cited. Scaliger (1561) asserts that poetry is the sweet coating of bitter truth; Varchi (1553) points out the power of example; Minturno (1564) analyzes a function of poetry similar to that of catharsis in the drama; Pinciano (1596) views as the goal of poetry the description of "essential beauty;" Mazzoni (1573) and Castelvetro (1570) see poetry to delight. In France Ronsard (1572) insists upon an allegorical interpretation of poetry and approves of Senecan "sentences." In England Lodge, Sidney, Webbe all emphasize the union of instruction with pleasure. (I have here followed Spingarn, Literary Criticism in the Renaissance).

17Cf. Saccharon, intr. (Vol.i, p.43): "As many times, most precious Lucas, as I in meditation have reasoned how you are all naturally pitying, so many times have I recognized that the present work, in your judgment, will have a grave and unpleasing beginning ----------

Let this inauspicious commencement be to you no otherwise than is to the traveler a mountain harsh and steep beyond which lies hid a plain delightsome and most beautiful, which appears so much the more pleasing as has been the greater the distress of mounting and descending." V. also Fenton, Tragicall Histories, Vol. II, 232.

[18] This interlaced poem, the Shepherd's Holiday, is Daye's own contribution to the variety. To the table of contents Daye might have added the portaiture of six seasons, a description of Pan, a war, an Alcibiadean love-adventure, etc.

[19] Cf. pp. 109-110; 128; 245. d'Ablancourt, the French translater, introduces a dull moral allegory into his continuation.

[20] Cf. preface to Amadis, Bk. XXLV, (1577): "Behold, reader, the fruit, which can be plucked from the mystic sense of the old romances by elect spirits, the common people contenting itself with the simple flower of the literal rendering".

[21] Utopia, 164; cf. 7; 21; 71; 161.

[22] Cf. preface to Helyas, Knight of the Swan (1520 ed.); also pp. 24; 120; 128.

[23] Spingarn (247) in saying that Lodge's Defense of Poetry is"novel enough" in its introduction into English criticism of the "allegorical and moral interpretation" has overlooked the prefaces not only of Adlington, but also of Painter and Fenton and North (v. especially the prefatory sonnet to the Morall Philosophy of Doni).

[24] "I intend to relate 100 novelle o favole o parabole o historie (whichever we may call them) recounted in ten days by an honorable company of seven ladies and of three youths in the evil time of the recent plague, and some songs of the said ladies chanted to their delight.....from which ladies who shall read these will be able to draw in equal measure delight from the solaceful matter set forth in them and useful counsel insofar as they will be able to know that which is to be fled and that which is, similarly to be followed."

[26] The problem of reception is itself prettily balanced. The decent stories are usually applauded. Of the unseemly tales II, 2; III,2; VII,5; Vii,7; and IX,6 arouse commendation of improper acts. II,7 begets envy of the many "marriages" of the sultan's daughter, and IX,2 produces joy that the nun involved escaped. Laughter, however, is the most common result. II,5; II,10 (their jaws ache); III,4; III,10 (a "thousand" laughs at what is perhaps the worst situation in the Decameron); V,4; V,10; Vii,2; Vii, 8; VIII,I; VIII,5; VIII,8; VIII,9 (laugh "until tears come"); IX,5 offer no decisive evidence. Three tales -- 1,4; III,I; VI,7 --awake a sensation os shame; after the first of these is told, "with a little of shame first the hearts of the ladies hearing were pricked, and with chaste blushes apparent in their faces gave sign: but after that the one looking at the other, scarcely able to restrain themselves from snickering, they hearkened. Then, the end of this tale having come, after she had reproved Dioneo with some sweet words (parolette), meaning that such novels were not to be told before ladies, the queen...." Yet-- why do the ladies laugh at the interlude before Day VI, at Dioneo's preface to IX?10, and at precisely the unnatural sexual acts of VII,2 and IX,3? Why, too, did Boccaccio himself write after IX,10: "How much they laughed at this novel, better understood by the ladies than Dioneo willed, let her think who yet is laughing?"

[27] Close of Day VI and also of Day 10. It is very clever to give this to the narrator of the most evil tales. Cf., however, Giannotto's

defense of immorality in the sixth novel of Day II (p. 133), and Filostrato's wish about the ladies and "hell" (close of III,10). One should cf. also the Fiammetta (132) where we read that that lady considers herself neither first nor last nor alone in her adultery: "rather, as it were, all those of the world have I for company, and the laws against which I have sinned are accustomed to pardon (sinners of her type)."

[25] Neifile's only indecorous tale is under Dioneo's reign. For "levities" v. Vol. I, 75; 99; 115; 130; 145; 161; 217; 234; 239; 252; Vol. II, 32; 128; 133; 155; 170; 200; 236; 242; 267; 276; 300; 354.

[28] Bandello, indeed, is not especially vigorous in defense. V emphasis on delight alone in dedications to Novella, Pts. I and II. Cf. also Day VII in Ser Giovanni's Il Pecorone, the lewd tales of which do not bear out the promise of Day V, where Aureto says: "Because I am to begin to-day, I wish that we leave the discussion of love, and commence a little to speak more morally and more historically, which will make us reputed of greater virtue and will be more fruitful."

[29] The bath scene in Decameron, Vol. II, 276, and that in the tomb of Catilina, II,354, stand alone. The Fiammetta has no such passages.

[30] For Painter's moral claim, v. further Palace of Pleasure, I,10; II,57; III,432. For Fenton's, v. Tragicall Histories, II,56; 312; 313.

[31] Miss Florence N. Jones of the Univ. of Illinois has suggested to me that one purpose of the Decameron is to teach eloquence; v. Day I. Reynier accredits the Heptameron with the same aim.

[32] Tragicall Histories, Tome I, [illegible]. The value of Fenton's book for the social deportment of magistrates, citizens, and women is elaborated. Cf. Painter, Palace of Pleasure, dedication to Tome II.

[33] True History, pp. 109-110. d'Ablancourt, in his translation, late in the seventeenth century, evidently thinks so, for in his continuation he satirizes the contes des fées. V. infra, ch. VI.

[34] In regard to names Boccaccio says (proemio, pp. 16-17): "The names of whom I should give truly, if a just reason did not keep me from saying them--which is this, that I do not wish that, through the matters which follow, recounted and heard of them, any of them in time to come may be shamed." Cf. Fiametta, where the heroine writes (p.36): "And in truth still my forces endure to such an extent, that, although I write most true matters, under such an order have I disposed them that, save for him who knows them as I, being the cause of all, no one, however acute understanding he have, will be able to know who I am." Of references to contemporaries, a passage before IX, 5 is most significant: "A novella, which, had I wished, or did I wish to depart from the truth of the matter, I should well have known and should know how to compose and relate under other names; but because the departing from the truth in novel-telling is a great diminution of delight in the hearer, in its own form.... I shall tell it." V. also Decameron, Vol. I, p. 226; 303; Vol. II, 90.

[35] Minturno's view, as given in note 16, may be compared. Of imitative prefaces the chief is that of Hélisenne de Crenne's Angoysses Douloureuses (1538).

"These things Dinias related to Aphis, and taking cypress tablets he export- the Athenian translated it write down the things, relating first of Cyrus; he was a word-artist. And he interpolates in their temples; and she also brought spices Isaeus/ and he instructed Cyrus rightly to imagine all the things [illegible] of, and himself to keep one of the tablets, and secretly he instructed that at the time he died she should the other enclosed in a coffer near (πλησίον) his tomb.

"Diogenes Antonius, interpolating Dinias discourses of all these things to Cyrus, nevertheless writes to Alexandra that it (?) together: of the Incredible beyond (θρύλλητα) Thule, and that he dedicates the romance to his sister Isidora. And he says.... that it is invents marvels and lies, at least he has for the greater part of the tales related by him the testimony of the ancients. And he ranges for each book the one who fathered those things, so that the lies should not seem to have authority. And at the beginning of the book he writes an epistle to his sister Isidora.... that he introduces one Dalgren writing to his wife while that at the capture of Tyre by Alexander....a soldier came to Alexander, saying that he would discover a thing strange and marvelious, and that the wonder was outside of the city. The king taking with him Ephaestion and Perdaccas followed the soldier and they discovered stone coffers under the earth, on which were written there a list of treasures of the characters of the work is detailed).... Passing by these....they came near a wall to a small coffer of cypress-wood, on which was inscribed: "O strangers, whoever you are, open this in order that you may learn what will amaze you." Those with Alexander opening the coffer, find the cypress tablets which (as it seems) Darrylis placed there at the command of Dinias. He (Diogenes Antonius) introduces Dalgren writing to his wife, in order that, having written aboutthe tablets, he might send them to his wife. And for the rest the story ,added to the [illegible] (γράψῃ) on the tablets." (Photius, Bibliotheca, A. Bekker, Vol. I,p. 111).

.7

V. also Vol. I, p.[illegible]; III,p.[illegible]IV,[illegible]. In the IV, the passage is long list of "authorities" the "Differ" is cited-- e.g., Demades in Lucrec, Cypros Brut, and

Anrico Frustro. Cf. Helyas, Knight of the Swan, pp. 23; 65; 103; 149; Robert the Devil, 51. Out of the large number of prose romances for which I have statistics, only Blanchardyn and Eglantine lacks some such phrase.

38 In Italy, among the critics of poetry, Robortelli (1548) advanced a theory of "vraisemblance". Ronsard in France (1572) objected to anachronisms. An anticipation of the Scudérian theory of vraisemblance (v. ch.5) underlies, perhaps, the otherwise unimportant defense made by Herberay of his alterations of the Spanish Amadis (1540).

39 "I will rather tell a lie than make a lie". (Preface to Utopia).

40 Novelle, Pt. I. tale 51. dedication. Cf. with these theories, however, Bandello's known revision of much older stories (still with the dedications about "current events"), and Boccaccio's remarks on masking truth, in note 34.

41 "Let us speak of" occurs in Merlin 105 times, and variant formulas at least 25. The most individual transition which I have noted is in Rabelais (Vol. I 49): "But my little skiff along these unpleasant gulfs and shoals will sail no further, therefore must I return to the port from whence I came."

42 Once we meet in Aucassin and Nicolete "Or laissons d'Aucassin si dirons de Nicolete" (79b). For the "ye have heard" type or its variants v. Merlin, pp.67; 92; 110; III; 122; 137; 151; 161; 176; 182; 192; 197, etc. For summaries v. Merlin 121; 131; 230; 238; 438; 440; 668;(all very long); Helyas, Knight of the Swan, 69; 71; 78; 89; 92; 93. The summaries from Helyas are all of Matabrun's crime, and are oddly suggestive of the summaries in Voltaire's Candide. Theagenes and Chariclea has one summary (157).

[43] The possible relation of the popularity of the Greek novel to the more artistic work of Sidney and others in regard to transition is worth notice. "Let us return" is no favorite of Sidney's. Yet it is common enough in the Amadis and in the Diana, two of his principal sources. On the other hand (I base my conclusions on Elizabethan translations, and on the Greek texts), in the Greek novel "let us return" occurs, I believe, only once (Clitophon and Leucippe, 469). The chief device for transition is that of time. Other methods in the Theagenes are the use of "but" (28; 33; 53; 59; 60; 131), the use of generalization (127), and the use of rumor. Twice (55; 225) there is no transitional phrase at all. It may be added here that a feature of early prose fiction, as distinguished from the structure of the ballads, the Elder Edda, and even the metrical romances, is that very seldom is there complete lack of a transitional word or phrase.

[44] This passage has further interest. As a theory of the structure of the oral tale it bears out my suggestion of the influence of that form. In addition, the translation, copied from the 1621 rendering of Boccaccio's Decameron, departs from the Italian by subjoining the bracketed words. Cf. Decameron, Vol.II, 84.

[45] The most honest confession is in Palmerin of England, Vol. IV, p.134: "Great labor would it be to attempt to recount minutely the compliments, ceremonies, and courtesies.... I will not make the attempt, both to excuse myself from this labor, and for fear also lest my words should debase that to which no words could do justice".

[46] I have elaborated this material because the common impression seems to be that of Furnivall (Intr. to Merlin, CCXLIV): "They seem to have regarded it as a literary crime to leave the most trivial detail to the imagination of the reader". The satire of Cervantes, Scarron, and Furetière (v.ch.4 and 5) is also unduly misleading on this point.

[47] Blanchardyn and Eglantine has (p. 15): "to arride, he was so [illegible] and endoctrined of the names and the usages for the most part of the habiliments." V., also ibid., omission of details of birth (12), of reverence and honors (14[illegible]), of hysterics (30), of lamentations (12): Helyas, Knight of the Swan, of games and dances (115): Diana, of dances and songs (272), of fables related (311), of dishes at dinner (217).

[48] Though theFiammetta and its imitations have many such passages, they seem entirely without effect upon the text; Fiammetta could not draw out her love-meditations (52) much longer, nor het her love-miseries (107). V. also 27; 53; 82; 87. Possibly the passage on love-manoeuvres (38) should be excepted. Arcadia (p. 126) is meaningless: "And in order not to go punctually relating all my woes."

[49] Two other reasons occasionally given for brevity are "the reference to the reader's imagination" and the "delicacy of a situation." Among the very few examples of the first is Sannazaro's remark on love-griefs (Arcadia, 143); "each one, without my recounting it, can fancy it himself:" Twice in the Decameron (Vol.II, 49; 301) is the second reason stated.

[50] The third point in regard to the attitude toward brevity -- the appearance of passages of this nature first in inserted conversation (p.14)-- can hardly be called expressed theory. It is of importance because it is most clearly seen in the Theagenes, which so strongly influenced Sidney and d'Urfé; for it is in the course of a long stretch of "reverting narrative" put in the mouth of Calasiris that we meet eight such comments as "And I supposed that you had been weary of this my so long prattling. But seeing you be so desirous...." (84). Cf. 88; 101; 124; etc. In the author's third-person portions we find such remarks on 10; 247; 259.

[51] It may be asked, do not the dictionaries afford help in determining the attitude toward digression? From the New English Dictionary we learn only that digression is "departure or deviation from the subject in discourse or writing" and that this meaning for the term is "the earliest and most frequent: "Chaucer's Troilus and Cressida (Bk. 1, 87; 143) and Lydgate's Chronicle of Troy (Bk. 1,1) are cited. Of the earlier makers of dictionaries, Philips in 1658 and Furetière in 1662 do not mention the word. Richelet in 1680 has an interesting definition, but it does not seem to apply to prose fiction even at that date; he writes: "A discourse which is not entirely a part of the theme but which should have some connection and which serves to embellish works of wit when it is well-put and to the point. Digressions should be short and clever." Bailey, Kersey, and others say nothing of moment. The Dictionnaire Universelle in 1734 remarks, "There is nothing more wearying than a tale full of long digressions."

[52] As usual (v. note 42), I have collated the Greek texts and the Elizabethan translations. The Golden Ass of Apuleius and the Satyricon of Petronius do not recognize their numerous divagations. When d'Ablancourt translated the True History, he twice added to Lucian's text a feeling for digression and has been followed by later English translators: for Lucian's "therefore I could not describe the natures" (of these monsters), d'Ablancourt has (p.9): "there is no need to report about them, and for Lucian's "and what things I, passing my time in the midst of the moon, observed new and strange, these I wish to write," he has (14): "before I pass further, it will not be out of place here to recount the marvels of the country".

[53] V. note 50. Just as the remarks upon brevity influenced similar remarks in Sidney, so I think did the remarks of the Theagenes upon digression: I cite three from the Greek, all also in Underdowne's version. "O Gnemon, if in untimely fashion now I talk about these things " (ed. Bekker, p. 91). "I, O Gnemon, wished least of all to annoy you with these and such-like outside matters" (Bekker, 77); Underdowne adds,

"but I would have brought you to the principal point of my tale." "Now dilating, O Gnemon, enough upon.... satraps and kings, it wanted but little that I had passed out of the bounds of my tale" (Bekker, 63). Cf. Underdowne, pp.65; 66; 79; 80; 91; 101; 84; 88; 124; 136.

[54] Cf. Bandello, Novelle, Pt. I, novella 26.

[55] Munday's version of the Palmerin de Oliva is full of this. There are traces in Boccaccio's Decameron. V. also Fenton, Vol. I, p. 160; II, 132; and Whetstone's Philotus and Emilia, 12.

[56] The Renaissance critics of poetry had much to say upon unity; this is of interest to us, for when these critics condemn Ariosto, they condmn by implication the mediaeval prose romances. Trissino (1548) assailed the Orlando Furioso for lack of unity. Cintro (1549) in replying that the Furioso was not amenable to Aristotle's laws, because Aristotle knew of no similar epics, further proceeded to define three kinds of epic, each having its own law of opening. The tupes were the true epic, "one action of one man," the romanza, "many actions of many men," and the biographical poem, "many actions of one man." The true epic was to open "in medias res", the romanza at "the most important event," the biographical poem at "the very beginning". (V. Spingarn, p. 114). Later, Castelvetro declared (1576) that we need not trouble ourselves whether a story has beginning, middle, and end. Tasso finally carried the day for "complex unity" -- a doctrine Ronsard then introduced into France..

[57] The Greek style of the Greek novelists is thus analyzed by Rhode. Xenophon's (p. 432, ed.1890) is careless, hard, with peculiar constructions, wrested meanings, and poverty of phrasing. Heliodorus's (492-3) is marked by turgid pomposity and farfetched meanings; he uses "sentences". Tatius's (516) is odd and affected, with

antitheses, cadences, and rhymes. Chariton's ([illegible]) is simple and clear, but flat. Longus's (550-551) is loose, simple, and melodious; its delicacy becomes affectation. Eustathius's is characterized by wearisome wittiness, by alliterative phrasing, and by foolish antitheses. Sidney speaks (Defence of Poesie, p. 28) of "sugred invention of that picture of love in Theagines and Chariclea." I fancy he is referring either to Amyot's or Underdowne's rendering. Underdowne mentions "a certain delightful oblectation".

[58] Dedication to Pt. I, Novella I, of the Novelle. Bandello's claim of "wr ote down in the rough" is found before nearly every novella; cf. Pt. I, novella 13, Pt. 1, 51 for salient passages..... The actual style of the Italian novellieri is rather difficult for a foreigher to describe; Boccaccio's style in the Decameron seems to me plain and direct, in the Fiammetta more ornate, but still simple, and in the Ameto rather flowery. The style of Ser Giovanni (1378) is plain but abominably slip-shod; how Dunlop (History of Prose Fiction, Vol. II, p. 157) could write, "In point of purity and elegance of style, Ser Giovanni is reckoned inferior only to Boccaccio", passes my comprehension. The style of Bandello exhibits traces of a pernicious ornamentation. The Italian pastoral writers one and all tend toward daintiness of phrase; Sannazaro, e.g., is affected and mincing.

[59] Spingarn says concerning poetic theory of style that in France Du Bellay in 1549 wished to introduce classical terms, Italian words, and trade neologisms; that Quintal Horatian in 1550 assailed this idea; that Pelletier in 1555 wished clearness above all other qualities; and that--most interesting for our study--Ronsard first preferred Homer's simplicity to Virgil's ornamentation, then a dozen years later, changed his allegiance.

[60] The treatment of three matters, two connected with the problem offered by unity, and the third revealing a theory of the letter-novel, seemed out-of-placein

the text proper; accordingly, the material is given here. The first matter deals with the inclusion of letters and verses, the second with the maintenance of a point of view. In regard to the inclusion of letters and verses the practice is diverse. Letters are found only rarely in the Greek novel and in the older romances; e.g., in the Merlin the only real letter is that of Ewein to Gawein (279). On the other hand, ten letters appear in the Diana (55; 56; 63; 64; 74; 193; 312; 325; 334; 336). The novella, in the hands of Fenton, contains long love-epistles. Verse also seems to be confined to the pastoral. The Merlin, the Palmerin of England, and the Greek novels, with the exception of the Daphnis and Chloe, contain no verse save four or six line oracles; and the Decameron includes (for the "more delight" according to Boccaccio) merely a song at the end of each day, and the song of Lisa in the seventh novella of Day X. The Il Pecorone follows the example of the Decameron, Bandello uses no verse. In Daphnis and Chloe, however, are seventeenpoems, in Scherillo's edition of the Arcadia III out of 317 pages are verse, and in Yong's Diana 191 out of 494. Neither letters nor verse, it is to be noted, are ever called digressions.

Concerning point of view we find this in the Diana (p.333). Perez, the author of Pt. II, makes Parisiles interrupt Placindus thus: "With thy good leave.....I would ask, how, being without, you might hear these speeches between them within," and Placindus reply, "From henceforth you must understand that we told one another all the matter that passed." Again, as in the case of phrases marking brevity and of apologies for digression we observe that the remark arises in an oral tale.

The theory of the letter-novel is hinted at in two passages of the Abelard and Heloise, which, it must be remembered, came to be viewed as a story rather than a series of letters (v. preface to the 1721 ed.). The first passage deals with the emotional appeal of a letter; one will find it again and again as the motice underlying this form of narrative from 1669-1740. "If a picture," writes Abelard (25), which is but a mute representation of an object, can give such pleasure, what can not letters inspire? They have souls; thay can speak; they have in them all that force which expresses the transport of the heart; they have all the fire of our passions, they can raise them as much as if the persons themselves were present; they

have all the tenderness and the delicacy of speech, and sometimes even a boldness of expression beyond it." The second passage touches upon style. Abelard cautions Heloise (26): "That writing may be no trouble to you, write always to me carelessly and without study; I had rather read the dictates of the heart than of the brain."

NOTES TO CHAPTER II.

[1] Two of the earliest attempts at classifying prose fiction are worth quoting. Charles Sorel in La Bibliothèque Françoise (1664; licensed 1659) writes (p. 149): Ces livres d'invention d'esprit sont sous la forme de Fables et d'Allégories, ou ce sont des Romans de Chevalerie, et de Bergerie, ou des romans vraisemblables, et des nouvelles, et des Romans Héroiques ou Comiques." d'Aubigné in the preface to Macarise (1664) recognizes fictions "sur quelques notables circonstances de l'histoire" (p.126), works which "doivent joindre le merveilleux au vraisemblable" (146), and narratives which are "quelques histoires de temps, tirées des cabales de la cour" (149). The analyses of Huet (Traité sur l'Origine des Romans, 1670) and of Lenglet-Dufresnoy are given in extenso in ch.5.

[2] In explaining just how this definition was arrived at, I may illustrate how I have used the material supplied by authors. The chronique scandaleuse and the voyage imaginaire have special purposes; the frame-work conte de fee is not based on love plus adventure, and has no unified structure; the letter-novel, also, has no unified structure; and, finally, the realistic narrative aimed to portray life as it is. That the forms are not mutually entirely exclusive is not my fault, but the authors'.

[3] Koerting, Geschichte des Französischen Romans im 17ten Jahrjundert, classifies romances much as I have done; I subsume his political under my allegorical, however, since all the political romances were allegorical in one sense, and add informational and satirical romances to his list.. From Miss Morgan, Rise of the Novel of Manners (ch.I) I differ entirely; I see no value in such nomenclatures as Arcadian, Euphuistic, or Classical.

[5] I borrow the title from Imbert's Chronique Scandaleuse (1791).

[5] I say this despite the applause given to Mlle. de Scudéry and others. Mlle's own words are significant (Conversations sur Divers Sujets, 1685, p. 48): "And I know several old senators here and even Roman matrons, to whom love would be so dreadful that they would even forbid their children to read a fiction of this kind". The conversation originally appeared in Clélie, Tome VIII (1654), which accounts for the mention of Rome.

[6] "Here have you this idle work of mine, which, I fear, like the spider's web, will be thought fitter to be swept away, than woven to any other purpose.. Now, it is done only for you, only to you; if you keep it to yourself, or commend it to such friends who will weigh errors in the balance of good-will, I hope, for the father's sake, it will be pardoned..... Your dear self can best witness the manner, being done in loose sheets of paper, most of it in your presence; the rest by sheets sent unto you, as fast as they were done." This preface seems to me to have been too much trusted. The Arcadia is altogether too coherent to have been written without some of Sidney's "loose sheets" being carefully related to rather remote predecessors. Cf. the prefaces quoted in this chapter, note 17.

[8] Jacke Wilton, pp. 72-73. Cf. Espinel's Marcos de Obregon (1618). The main purpose is: "a aligerar por algun espacio, con alivio, y gusto, la carga que oprime de V. S. Illustrissima"....But important minor aims immediately follow this: to teach morality, reverence to God, etc.

[7] When these fairy-tales were translated into English, they were given highly moral prefaces. V. that to the Peruvian Tales (1734 tr.), the Tartarian Tales (1759), the Mogul Tales (1736). One notes, too, that when J. K. completed the Peruvian Tales, he introduced an adventure (v. Novelists' Magazine, Vol. xxi, p. 190) which allowed him to give an allegorical explanation for some unseemly pages of Gueullette's own work.

[9] Cf. the prefaces to Sorel's Francion (1622), and to Gil Blas. Mabbe, prefacing a version of Cervantes's Exemplary Novels in 1640 contrasts strangely with the Spanish author in his remarks of 1613:: "could I by any means suppose that these novels could excite any bad thought or desire in those who read them, I would rather cut off the hand with which I write them than give them to the public". Mabbe says: "I will not promise any great profit you shall reap by reading them; but I promise they will be pleasing and delightful." Furst in his Vorläufer der Modernen Novelle (1897) naively accepts (p. 5) not only Cervantes's preface as token of his moral ardor, but even his title-- Novelas Exemplares.

[10] If any one who believes these prefaces of Greene will count the number of times "strange," "surprising," or "marvelous" creeps into the titles or dedications, I fancy he will change his opinion. Cf., also, ch.III, and the chronological arrangement of De Foe's prefaces in the appendix.

[11] Works which I have classed as psychological novels, but which show affiliations with the picaresque tales and with the novels of manners, can afford to be bolder than these latter; they aid their claim of "truth" (v. ch.III) by the assertion of having been written for the delight of the author or an intimate friend. The prefaces of Marivaux to Marianne and to the Paysan Parvenu --taking the form, it is true, of the opening to the first chapter -- are easily accessible. Less known are prefatory remarks to the Aventures de..... (1713)(by Marivaux?): "he wrote these adventures to amuse the lady whom he loved;" or to Mme. Tencin's Comte de Comminges (1735): "I have no other design in writing these memoirs of my life than to recall the smallest circumstances of my misfortunes, and to grave them still more deeply, if that is possible, upon my memory."

[12] The heroico-historical romances worked pleasure into their theory, and are best left for full descussion in ch. 5. For the pastoral romance see the preface to the Astrée.

For the informational-conversational romance see the Euphues; for the satirical Quixote and the Berger Extravagant (1627). Bougeant in Prince Fan-fareiin, a critique on fiction (1735) offers a peculiar defiance to the ordinary claim: "I detest romance, you know; I see that you love them; and I declare war against you."

13 Cf. du Verdier, Romants des Romans (a continuation of the Amadis-cycle, 1624): "it is possible that you will still blame the design that I have made of finishing a work that you would judge little useful to posterity; but if you could know my thoughts, you would draw an excellent fruit from an earth so unfruitful, you would find there an example for virtuous living in the mode (bienseance) of the world, you would know how necessary it is to love holily, and seeing the misfortunes which often indeed are born from an unregulated lone, without doubt you would encounter ways to retire yourself from this precipice." Is it not curious that Baker should write in the preface to his edition of Sidney's Arcadia: "The pastoral novel and the Amadis cycle of romances were the two direct progenitors of Sidney's Arcadia, in which the spirit of knightly heroism and the idyllic atmosphere of a sentimental Utopia are blended in fairly equal parts"; and that Raleigh in his English Novel (p.90) speaks of the true love of the chivalric romances degenerating to gallantry in the romances of the seventeenth century? For in the Amadis and the Palmerin cycles reigns a care-free licentiousness (v.ch.9).

14 The lines quoted are from Koerting, p. 217, Vol.I. V., also, ch. 4.

15 Cf. with these statements the prefaces of Jaques Sadeur, The Sevarambians, or Gaudentio de Lucca, as quoted in ch. III.

16 Preface to New Atalantis, Vol. III. V., also, the same lady's Memoirs of Europe

at the Close of the 8th Century, wherein (p.234), when Horatio objects to Girron's malignant gossip. Girron answers calmly, "If we speak of 'em, we must speak of 'em as they are". Mrs Manley's real aim appears, it seems to me, in (p.I): "Our design is to treat of rough Bellona's formidable charms; Mars dreadfully gay.... But to take in and complete our circle with the lovely sex..... we shall not forbear to introduce the queen of love."

[17] In this and the following short accounts of the relation of purpose to content and structure completeness is not aimed at.. The more important effects are summarized. Detail is given at various points throughout the book.

[18] The Peruvian Tales is included here because it is nearer to being a unified narrative than many a work which passes as a novel of manners. In its 218 pages are but two stories, one left unfinished.[1]

[19] Preface to Colonel Jacque (1722): "Here's room for just and copious observations on the blessings and advantages of a sober and well-governed education.... also how much public schools and charities might be improved.....the miserable condition of unhappy children." Abuse of the conditions in schools is found at least as early as Francion (1622), from which salient passages are given in Koerting, Vol.II, 54-57, and in Breton, 66-74; I think, however, both these commentators do not allow for Sorel's fondness for satire-- let truth fare as she may. Dibelius, Englische Romankunst, (Band I, 35-43) regarding Defoe as an isolated phenomenon, gives him, I think, entirely too much credit for serious efforts at reform.... Apart from this one phase of the social purpose, may be mentioned here a seeming desire to present in humanitarian fashion the distress arising from forced marriages or cloisteral immurement of daughters for economic reasons, a demand that slaves be better treated, and as onslaught upon dueling. Forced marriages and cloistral immurement are, according to Reynier,

ch.X. the motifs of a group of novels from 1600-1610. Lydamant et Calliante (1607) has, "Girls are slaves of their condition, miserable in that they have no choice in the matter most dependent upon their choice," and Mortune d'Amour (1603): "Behold here the flame of the mortuary torches which paternal cruelty has all too miserably enkindled." I can not evaluate these aims, because I have not been able to see these works. On the next topic, the demand that slaves be better treated, I am better informed. The demand is heard chiefly in Mrs. Behn's Oroonoko (1688) and in Mrs. Aubin's Noble Slaves (1721). Mrs. Behn, I am sure, is not in earnest, despite Cross (The English Novel, p. 20), who calls Oroonoko "the first humanitarian novel," V. my ch.X, note , where Mrs. Behn's relation to the development of fiction is discussed. Mrs. Aubin really seems to mean "We can not think without horror of the miseries that attend those, who in countries where the monarchs are absolute, and standing armies awe the people, are made slaves to others". As for the attacks upon dueling, the assaults of Barclay's Euphormio (v. Koerting, Vol.II, 9;22) and Camus's Cléoreste (v. Koerting, Vol.I, 198) preceded Henry IV's edict against dueling in 1627. The Nova Solyma (1648) assails the practice in the preface. Later remarks of importance are to be found in the Memoires de la Vie du Comte D..... (1696), Vol.II, p.84, and in Prevost's Homme de Qualite (Vol. V, p. 90). Fénelon, of course, wrote Telemachus (1699), partly that he might embody his views upon dress, furniture, architecture, etc.

20 The Gyges Gallus, a mixture of character-book and novel of manners, has a hero who in the preface regards his aim as novel; "Having gained the ring of invisibility, he writes: "as soon as, being received everywhere, I shall have known the customs, ridiculous and even criminal of my century, I shall write them." But the Gyges Gallus lacks plot. The Francion (1622), which has plot, carries on the movement: "In it are only naive descriptions of the vices of some men, and of all their faults.....or of some trickeries of others." Cf. also the prefaces to Polyandre (1648), which exhibits six Parisian types, to La Vie du Comte D.... (1696), which presents forty or more feminine types as mistresses of the hero, and to Crebillon's

Comte de Mailtwaur (1755).

[21] Various other citations will show how wide-spread the admiration for the natural man was before Rousseau. "For this people always keep a good guard upon the frontier, as being apprehensive that strangers may come, and by ill examples corrupt their innocence, disturb their tranquility, and introduce vice and wickedness among them" (Sevarambians, p. 202). "And their manner of living....may pass for a perfect image of the state of man in full possession of natural happiness upon the earth" (Jaques Saduer, preface). "And these people represented to me an absolute idea of the first state of innocence, before man knew how to sin; and 'tis most evident and plain, that simple nature is the most harmless, inoffensice, and virtuous mistress. 'Tis she alone, if she were permitted, that better instructs the world than all the invention of man; Religion would here but destroy that tranquillity they possess by ignorance; and laws would but teach 'em to know offences, of which they have now no notion" (Oroonoko, pp.79-80). V. also Montesquieu's Lettres Persanes, letters X-XIV, giving the history of the Troglodytes, and the account of the Abaqui in Prevost's Cleveland, Vol. II, 203 seq. (1769 ed).

[22] By far the most curious of these special pleadings is the Avantures de Madona et Francis d'Assisi, the author of which is an exile after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes; the preface is remarkable alike for a wish to gain converts, and, if necessary, to retail nastiness. The author writes to Charles XII: "provided that your Majesty find pleasure therein, let the Vatican growl, let it thunder, let it lightning, I shall trouble myself little. Perhaps even as these adventures divert your Majesty, they will cause to be born the thought of imitating the great Gustavus, and the desire of reducing to reason the enemies of your state!" further on, he adds: "To complete the confusion of the Papacy by itself, it has come into my mind to render public among the Protestants the life of its principal saints, and to give this work a novelistic form (air de roman), in order not to tire the reader,

and to make more impressive the ridiculousness and the falsity of the things which are reported by the legendaries".

[23] V. The prefaces to the Homme de Qualité, to Cleveland, and to the Doyen de Killerine. The last is the most significant: Cleveland had been attacked on various grounds, and in the preface to the Doyen de Killerine (1735-1740) Prevost defends himself by pointing out that Cleveland had struggled to attain morality, unsupported by a creed, until-- "it is in the conversations with that illustrious friend that he finds peace of heart, and true wisdom with the perfect recognition of religion." "Such," he adds, "is the plan of the English Philosopher." In the Doyen de Killerine one notes that Georges goes to destruction as a result of "natural religion." Cf. also Homme de Qualité, Vol.II, pp. 50-52. Mrs. Aubin's preface to the Count de Vinevil must also be considered.

[24] Cf. Mrs. Haywood, preface to Memoirs of an Island Adjacent to Utopia (1725). How smirkingly she writes (ibid., Vol.II. p.120): "Example has infinitely more power than precept to sway the mind of man either to good or ill."

[25] Preface to Sofonisbe (1627): "In the same way it is necessary to take care that the amours one treats of shall be so chaste and so honorable that they cannot displease the most delicate ears". Some of Gerzan's situations, however, incline the reader to qualify this assertion a trifle.

[26] Preface to Pt. I of Guzman (1599):"That which thou shalt find less grave or discomposed, presents itself in the person of a picaro, which is the subject of this book. Such things as these....sport thyself with them..... and afterwards shake hands."

27 Furetière's defense of the Amadis (preface to Roman bourgeois) is singularly like Lamb's plea for the Restoration dramatists; "Toi entre ceux-là est l'Amadis très puis il exprime naïvement les passions amoureuses, et mieux elles s'insinuent dans les jeunes âmes, ou il se glisse un venin imperceptible, qui a gâté le coeur qu'on puisse avoir pris du contrepoison. Ce n'est pas comme ces autres romans ou il n'y a que des amours des princes et des belles dames qui, n'ayant rien de proportionée avec les personnes de commun, ne les touchent point, et ne font point naître d'envie de les imiter."

28 I do not agree with Koerting (Vol.I, p. 205) when he questions the sincerity of Camus's moral aim. It is true that his position is difficult to determine. We find before his Singular Events (162?; tr 1631) a preface suggestive of the extreme stand of the purists: "The enterprise which I have taken in hand, is to....encounter with those frivolous books, which may all be comprised under the name of romants (he includes the Italian novelle)....O why hath not my pen the virtue to cure the wounds that these wicked books cause in the world:....It makes me fear a labor like unto that of Danaides.....By what manner do I labor to overcome my adversaries? It is by diversion, setting relations true and beneficial...." On the opposite, we find within the Singular Events some novelle, more gruesome than any I have ever read, the Curried Lovers, e.g. Is Camus, then, a Greene or Defoe? It seems to me that the 100 pages of defense before Agatonphile (1623), the passage quoted from Clécreste, and another from Aristandre (1624): "David committed two sins of horror, adultery and homicide, which are those which play most part in this German history," bear the accent of sincerity. Let the reader note the difference between these frank remarks, and an English lie (Head's Art of Wheedling, 1675): "Consider Brutus and his confederates are not forgot in Livy; Sinon lives in Virgil and Pandarus in Homer; there is a Lais Memorable in Corinth and a Lamia in Athens, and why should we not match those rampant whores with a pair of as lusty rogues?" Cf. also the prefaces to such works as Mme. de Villedieu's Annales Galantes (167?) or Jane Barker's Exilius (1715).

[29] Le Roman au 18ème Siècle, p. 31-40.

[30] Cf. Gil Blas, Vol.III, p. 101; III,155; IV, 16; IV,83.

[31] Robinson Crusoe, Vol.II, preface (1719 ed.). The Nova Solyma (1648) extols the romance for allowing digressions, and Ingelo in the Bentivolio and Urania (1660) and Boyle in Theodora and Didymus (1680) revel in the scope for preaching afforded by a pious purpose. In France, also, Brémont, an earlier translator of Guzman, considers it a merit to say: "J'ai ajouté de petites façons." On the other hand, Espinal in the Marcos de Obregon (1618) had anticipated Le Sage by writing: "We ought never to stick too closely to dry doctrinal points, or give too great a loose to the play of the imagination; morality may be introduced under pleasing colors, and doctrine also be blended with delight:" and Sorel remarks upon Guzman in his Bibliothèque Française (1664): "it is true that one has restrained the moral discourses which seem too long for this sort of book" (a reference to a t translation of 1647?).....Care should be taken not to attribute to Le Sage a strict theory of unity. He is not opposed to narrative digressions, for he follows the quotation already cited by: "It is true that Mateo is sometimes too concise. If he elaborates almost always.....when he moralizes, he deducts for that from his comic actions, which he recounts too succinctly". V. also ch.VII.

[32] V. Moll Flanders, preface: "The pen employed in finishing her story and making it what you now see it to be, has had no little difficulty to put it into a dress fit to be seen....to wrap it up so clean as not to give room, especially for vicious readers, to turn it to his disadvantage;" or Roxana: "all imaginable care has been taken to keep clear of indecencies". Mrs. Aubin before Lady Lucy (1726) and Mrs. Barker before Exilius (1715) have similar apologies.

[33] With the first blush of shame by the ladies of the Decameron -- easily forgotten-- should be compared the very vigorous reproofs administered to a French Dioneo by the ladies of Mariane du Filomène (1596). The English version of the Decameron in 1620 softens the frank diction of the stories of Dioneo on days three and nine. Baudoin's Diversitez Historiques (1620) has not a single unchaste line or situation. Boyle's Theodora and Didymus (1686) is scrupulously delicate in delineating a stew and its victims. The preface to Panaion and Amphigeneia, however (1665), is untrustworthy. So it goes through the century.

[34] Since a taking of prefaces at face value has sometimes led to a miscomprehension of the author's attitude, it has seemed worth while to append my feeling upon the trustworthiness of the more important authors in their claims of edification. The social and religious aims may in general be accepted as valid. In the case of the moral aim proper the following writers seem to me double-tongued: in England Greene, Head, Kirkman, Defoe, Mrs. Manley, and Mrs. Haywood; in France Sorel, Furetière, Sandras, and Crébillon; in Spain Alemán, Quevedo, and Pérez. With reservations the following may be trusted: in England Mrs. Behn, Mrs. Barker, and Mrs. Aubin; in France Le Sage and Marivaux; in Spain Cervantes. Other important authors are in general sincere. As for minor writers the text or special notes furnish information.....Let me illustrate, however, how dangerous it is to quote a preface by itself. In a monograph by Stanglmeier upon Jane Barker he lauds her high moral aim, and quotes her preface to Exilius as a proof. Now, Stanglmaier overlooks two points to be taken into consideration: one, of course, the book itself; the other, the type of preface popular in 1715. Mrs. Aubin, Mrs. Butler, and Mrs. Hearne all have similar prefaces; I regard them all as dubious. Again, Clodius's attitude within the volume (a) toward the siren's wife (p.245), and (b) toward Libidina (p. 282) are suggestive of several things-- among them the value of Mrs. Bauder's "high" moral aim. Miss Morgan, too, (Novel of Manners) (p.104), strangely accepts the truth of Mrs. Barker's declaration that she is imitating Telemachus -- a bare-faced lie.

35 The use of references to authorities at the side of the text, e.g. In the preface to Don Quixote this device is amusingly attacked, but it reappears in Bentivolio and Urania (1st ed.), Pilgrim's Progress, etc. Camus writes before Agatonphile (1620): "I had taken pains to put in the margin of the text the citations from authority (des lieux de l'ecriture)....but.....these fringes were more ample than the robe."

36 Camus's remarks before Dorothée (1621) are another proof of his sincerity: "Therefore the song of Solomon will be rejectable (by the advocates of purity) because of ses termes si tendreset.....ses inventions si delitieuses.....but those who employ such terms for the service of modesty, why shall they be blamable?"

37 Certain minor effects upon fiction may well be recalled or suggested. Both the relation of the insertion of moral comments to incoherence of structure and the development by Camus of the doctrinaire novel have been mentioned; surely the constant result of the doctrinaire novel has been to stultify the individual character into the type. Again, the service of the care-free conte de fée to the romantic revival of the eighteenth century should not be underestimated. In regard, finally, to the development of character (cf. ch.X), one passage illustrating the early use of "contrast" may be quoted: "They will see here four very different courts of great princes: one where reigns pride, insolence, and cruelty; another where there is talk only of valor, generosity, and other virtues necessary to conquerors; in another they will see only cowardice, voluptuousness, and debauchery; and in the other a wisdom so great that at its liking it dominates all the passions" (Desmaret's Rosane, 1639).

38 As in the Telemachus, e.g., which has no preface. Here, however, certain passages are key-notes to the purpose of the author. V.pp. 85; 161; 352.

[39] Confusion with other purposes is well illustrated in Quevedo's Travels (1644), (and not by Quevedo), where we wander among many satirical lands, beholding all types of women, save those of Black-Swan-Mark, called the "Modestianians."

[40] V. pp. 95 (religious freedom); 454 (philosophy); 19;65;139;206;254;355(government.)

[41] English translation of 1692. Cf. the preface to Memoires Secretes pour servir a l'histoire de Perse (173?), or that to Sandras's Coligny (1685).

[42] The bank-handed strokes of Swift in Gulliver's Travels are hittled noticed. "I meddle not,"we are told (Vol.II, p.188), "with any party, but write without passion, prejudice, or ill-will against any man or number of men whatsoever". Yet once at least Swift unmasks (11,.192): "I had conceived a few scruples with relation to the distributive justice of princes upon those occasions". There follows a digression upon colonizing.

[43] Ribault, prefacing in 1662 the Empires of the Sun, writes: "I can further say to you that he has perhaps believed that a roman should be a new method of treating important matters, which would be able to touch the taste of the minds of the century, and that he has written in the same mentiment that makes Lucretius defend himself for having made wisdom speak in verse".

[44] Certain miscellaneous aims of Gerzan and others will illustrate the situation very clearly. "In l'Afriquaine," says Gerzan (1627-1628), "I discover two admirable masterpieces which great intellects have always concealed, of which the one acts

powerfully for the conservation of the radical humidity (l'humide radical), and through the other the ladies can arrive at the height of beauty, be it for whiteness, be it for delicacy of skin.....In l'Amériquaine (I reveal) the savage mode of life of some peoples of the Indies, and the singularities of their country". So in l'Asiatique he intends an allegory "of our days,"mixed, however, with information about ancient forms of worship: and in l'Européane he means to analyze "the evil-doing of a favorite". It is interesting that Gerzan reprinted some of this material in 1643 under the captions La Triomphe des Dames and Le Grand Or Potable des Philosophes. Head gives in a postscript to Vol.I of the English Rogue (1665) the following aim: "and (I) shall ere long discover what further progress he made in his cheats..... not omitting the description of those places wherein he perpetrated his rogueries". Ramsay in the Travels of Cyrus (1727) insists that he, like Xenpphon, makes his hero travel in order to teach the reader history and geography. Even Mrs. Barker in Exilius (1715) timidly hopes that the peruser may "gain some gleanings of history". But one might heap up quotations of this kind. The effect upon structure is best seen in these lines from the Hughes and his England, pp. 162-163: "Gentlemen and gentlewomen, these Lenten evenings be long and a shame it were to go to bed; cold they are, and therefore folly it were to walk abroad; to play at cards is common, at chess tedicus, at dice unseemly, with Christmas games untimely. In my opinion.....I would have some pastime that might be pleasant but not unprofitable, rare, but not without reasoning."

[45] The most promising contribution, Gerzan's l'Amériquaine, seems not to have been written. In Gomberville's Polexandre, Pt. V. pp.1375-1377, there is a description of the Caribbeans.

[46] On all this material cf. chs. V, VI, XI.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III.

[1] Cf. Preschac, L'Illustre Parisienne (1679; tr. by Mrs. Haywood as The Disguised Prince, 1726): "contain only matters of fact, and have, indeed, something so very surprising in themselves, that they stand not in need of any embellishments from fiction:" and Prévost, Manon Lescaut: "I must advise the reader that I have written his history almost as soon as I heard it, and that one can be assured in consequence that nothing is more exact and faithful than this narration." We may add that the types of fiction mentioned in the text as free from these claims are not so in every case, and that the comments upon trustworthiness hold much as they did in ch.II.

[2] Greene, Works, Vol. VI, 91;116 (Menaphon); Vol. VII, II; 13 (Perimedes). Lodge, Robert the Devil, preface, and pp. 10; 24. Sidney, however, had written in the Defense of Poesie (p.83): "the poet citeth not authorities of other's histories, but ever for his entry calleth the sweet muses to inspire him a good invention."

[3] V. ed. 1632, Vol.II, p.969. It is to be noted that Gomberville also devotes many pages at the close of Pt. V (ed. 1637) to an arraying of authorities for his material. The use of an invisible island is defended(1332-1362) by reference, more or less extended, to Ptolemy, don Juan de Mendoc (History of China, Pt. II, Bk.3), Bercius, and others; Diodorus Siculus is transcribed at length; and Lopez, author of a History of the West Indies, is severely censured for his incredulity expressed in his Bk.XVI, ch.28.

[5] "The principal ones are de Thou, Aubigné, Brantôme, Cabrera, Camprana, Adriani, Natalis Comes, Duplex, Mathieu Mayerne, Mézerai, le Labourent sur Castelnau, Strada, Meteren, l'Histoirien de dom Juan d'Autriche, les Eloges du P. Hilarion de Cosse, un livre Espagnol des dits et faits Heroiques de Philippe II, une relation de la mort et des obsequies de son fils.....There is in addition citation from divers pieces serving for history, as many in manuscript as printed. Among others from a little

book in verse, entitled Diogenes, which treats this matter profoundly, and from a manuscript of Monsieur de Peyrese, expressly upon this subject. Nevertheless, for the greatest satisfaction of readers, one has put at the margin of the most singular passages.....the principal authors from which they have been drawn."

[6] Breton (p.115) speaks of the preface of Cleveland as being unecessary because the characters are so real. Despite the truth of this remark from our standpoint, there is much in the book as it stands that could not be accounted for, were it not for the feeling which lay back of Prévost's preface.

[4] A list follows, wherein we read the names of Heraclitus, Xenophon, Mersenne, Gilbert, Helvetius, and Gassendi.

[7] The use of the Ms. must have been wide-spread before 1649, for in that year, Mlle. de Scudery in the preface to Artamene suggests that the readed who wants "certainty" may imagine that a rare Ms. has been found in the Vatican. Ladice, a heroico-historical romance of 1650, has: "Encountering some years ago in Holland an Englishman who was returning from the Indies, well versed in the Persian and Arabic tongues, he read to me some pages from a book which he translated....." The most illuminating of the later prefaces may well be listed here-- those to Jaques Sadeur, the Persian Tales, the Turkish Tales, the Peruvian Tales, the Soirées Bretonnes, the Lettres Persanes, Defoe's Avery, Moll Flanders, and Roxana, Swift's Gulliver, Desfontaine's Nouveau Gulliver, the English Hermit, Gaudentio de Lucca, Marianne, Mémoires d'un Homme de Qualité, Cleveland, Doyen de Killerine.

[8] The changes upon the finding of the Ms., the condition of the papers that compose it, and the clever account of how the Ms. passes from hand to hand must be read

in order to be appreciated. Preface and narrative are practically one, the story being intended as a dexterous assault upon Catholicism and a panegyric of naturalism. The editor, it seems is a friend of Signor Rhédi, Librarian of St. Mark's at Venice, who one day in return for a service rendered him by the editor desplays a unique literary treasure-- the Ms. of a confession made before the Inquisition at Bologna by one Gaudentio de Lucca. This Ms. the librarian had previously received in recompense for a gift made by him to Ivorio, the Secretary of the Inquisition at Bologna; The letter accompanying the gift of the Ms. is fully transcribed. In addition, there is a very large amount of extremely vivacious and circumstantial detail concerning the appearance, character, and secret trial of Gaudentio. Finally we meet the Ms. Given, as has been said, in the form of a confession before the Inquisition, it has as a result, a peculiar method of narration. Sometimes it preceeds in the form of direct autobiography, sometimes through the medium of questions by the Grand Inquisitor-- questions ingeniously worded so that the answers are amplifications of a recital the confessee wishes to hasten, sometimes, finally, in the shape of explanatory notes by Rhédi (who represents pretty well a doubting reader). These notes comprise 21 pages out of 215, and are three times "renoted" by the English editor. Missing portions of the Ms., here and there, are ascribed to careless customs house officials at Marseilles. The Ms. closes with an addendum by Ivoric to the effect that Lucca is to be freed, on condition of leading missionaries to Mezzorania.

[9] Cf. "I have been assured that this history was found with some others of the same nature among the papers of an illustrious dame who died a year or two ago". (Histoire Secrète de Henri IV, 1664). In this particular instance the chief proofs seem to be letters, of which some are inserted in the text, and about 43 printed in an appendix. V. also the prefaces to Sandras's Rochefort (1691), Colbert (1694) d'Artagan (1700), and Montbrun (1703). The Memoirs of D'Artagan was the source of Les Trois Mousquetaires; the great copyist took it as genuine.

[10] The Journey to the Moon (1697?) may be by Defoe. If so, he [illegible] in quite another fashion than that indicated in the Storm (1704). The preface begins by a rejection of "truth-telling", and sneers at the geese of Gonzales (1638). The writer of this Journey "fix'd" himself "upon an high mountain at the time of the Full-Moon," and turned his "thoughts wholly upon that globe" so as to "subtract them" from his own. Presently he found his "imagination drawn in a direct line to the world in the moon, and so left the "machine of" his body "in a sound repose". He "almost instantly arrived" at the desired post." It is interesting that Mr. H. G. Wells in a Modern Utopia uses the same idea.

[11] V. the opening of Bk.III, Vol.I of the Mémoires d'un Homme de Qualité, where the close of the Comte de Rosambert's story is summarized, because the Memoirs of that Comte are already before the public.

[12] A reason is given for this license; that travelers must repeat tales to satisfy the curious. In the preface to the Severambians it is suggested that nations send out "sworn explorers".

[13] Less quoted is the solemn preface to the third part of Robinson Crusoe (ed.1720):"I, Robinson Crusoe, being at this time in perfect and sound mind and memory, thanks be to God therefore, do hereby declare.....That the story, though allegorical, is also historical." Lemuel Gulliver in the signed edition of 1727 cries out against "alterations and insertions to compliment the memory of her late Majesty"; and (p. 1st ed.) allows Gulliver an elaborate defense for not reporting his discoveries to the government.

[14] The Mémoires de la Vie du Comte L...., even though "the author proposes in no way to make known those of whom he speaks," have to be reedited) we are told, because "he has often failed of this precaution." As a result, the editor (is it really, as the title-page says, the famous St. Évremond?) "has been obliged to change ranks, dates, etc/ "more than once" Cf. also the following passage (Vol. I, p.136) "The precautions which I wish to take in writing these memoirs, in order not to reveal who I am, keep me from giving here the detail of an action which distinguished me in the battle." Cf. further ibid., Vol.I, 250, and II, 38, and the Mémoires de la Comtesse de M....., p.47.

[15] Of non-novelistic, yet fictiticus memoirs those published as the Turkish Spy (1682) exhibit all these ruses to an unusual degree. But the Turkish Spy did not, as is often said, originate them.

[16] "The only fault I find is that the author, after the manner of travelers, is a little too circumstantial". Swift adds that, had he left the Ms. with all its minutiae in regard to soundings, etc., it would have been twice the length it is.

[17] The preface to the Life and Adventures of Duncan Campbell (1720) indicates intricacies of this movement I have not ventured to impose upon the reader. One bit is delicious. The quack Campbell is made to call his "editor" a "good old gentleman". V. also the preface to Prévost's Doyen de Killerine.

[18] Doubtless to these should be added a love of mystification,and an urgent desire to avoid peril (many French works are from Dutch or English presses.) Such purposes are not expressed, and so no part of "conscious theory".

[19] Sandras (La Guerre de Holland, 1679) aims to improve upon history in living the "secret affairs of the cabinets." Cf. the Comtesse Murat's Comte de Dunois (1670): "Your highness will see him only amorous and tender in this adventure; it is the sole passage of his life of which general history makes no mention;" and Mme. d'Auluoy's Memoires de la Comte d'Essegue (1691): "It is not in general histories that one learns particularities".

[20] Camus's attitude is, I must admit, inconsistent. The passage in the text is strengthened by (Cléoreste, Vol. II, p. 678): "and it is not at all necessary to say that this disguise alters truth; on the contrary, I hold that it conserves it, in the same fashion that the complexion of ladies is preserved by the masks that they wear". On the other hand, we read before Agathe a Lucie (1622): "All lving has dissimulation (de fard) and charms to the prejudice of truth;" and "What a pity it is to see matters which exist only in the void of the imaginations of those who have invented them, and which are entirely without probability, treated with so much art and so much care." Before Moral Events (162?), also, we find: "It is no small advantage that fantastical relations have over those that are true, for those (the former) are made at pleasure like.....images of wax....narrations of things which have truly happened are tied to more subjection". It should be added that Camus strives for realism in character and locale of action.

[28] Before Fontaines's Mémoires de Madame de Barnevöldt (1732) we have: "One would perhaps wish that I should render account of the manner in which these memoirs have fallen into my hands. That is what ordinarily editors of memoirs do.... As for me, on the contrary, I should fear to seem unseasonably to search for praise, should I tell the truth upon this point. The public will believe what it judges proper". Mocking prefaces are not to be overlooked. That to the Peruvian Tales is fair; that to Crébillon's Tanzai et Néadarné (1734) is a masterpiece. Even Defoe's preface to the Life and Adventures of Captain Avery (1719) has a doubtful ring when compared with his other prefaces. V. also Colonel Jacque, preface.

[23] Certainly the "examination" of memoirs in the manner of Sorel's or of Huet-foe can not be called a defense of the imagination. And the claims of "invention" or "originality" are usually offset by insistence upon the truth of the matter used See the prefaces to Cervantes's Exemplary Novels (1613), to Head's English Rogue (1665), to Crowne's Pandion and Amphigenia (1665), to Ramsay's Travels of Cyrus (1727). Cervantes says: "These are my own, neither imitated not stolen from anyone; my genius has engendred them, my pen has brought them forth; and they are growing up in the arms of the press"; but he evidently refers to the form into which he has thrown the tales, for after each novella we learn that poets have long celebrated his characters, and that they have descendants yet living. Crowne is audaciously mandacious, considering that he pilfered the Arcadia: "all is genuine..... nothing stole, nothing strained.... so neither is she (his Muse) one of those dung-bred Scarabies.....whose works are only glimmering lights, lightened at the touches of some deceased poets".

[24] These statements of indifference (exclusive of the enemies of Mss.) are so few that all may be quoted. The Tombeau des Romans (1626) reiterates for thirty pages (51-81): what does it matter? The Nova Solymn states (1648): "the scene of the tale is laid here in Nova Solyma.....but whether the work is fact or fiction is a minor point compared with the intention of the book-- that is to say, the right ordering of a Christian's life." Mme. d'Aulnoy before the Comte de Warwick writes: that the story is hers (she alters history). Mrs. Aubin has before the Comte de Vinevil (1719): "As for the truth of what this narrative contains, since Robinson Crusoe has been so well received, which is more improbable, I know no reason why this should be thought a fiction;" and before the Life of Madame de Beaumont (1721): "I'll not give myself much trouble to clear their doubts about this"?. Her later tales ignore the whole problem. Mrs. Barker in Exilius (1715) explains: "As to the historical part, I suppose the reader does not expect much exactness, it being a romance, not a history; so it matters not who, or who, were contemporaries". Lamekis (1735)

leaves the public to judge of "events so singular and so extraordinary". Crébillon prefaces the Comte de Moilcour (1736): "whether one ought to regard these purely as a work of imagination, or whether the adventure which they contain are real...." V. also the prefaces to the Adventures of Abdallah, Son of Hanif (1712), the Peruvian Tales, etc. But what are all these efforts against the prefaces of Defoe, Prévost, and Marivaux?

[21] V. the lines on p. 45 for the Comtesse de M.....'s words. Sandras in prefacing the Marquis de Montorun (1703) speaks of untrue works and adds that he knows some. But he is not ironically referring to his own veracious narratives.

[25] The primacy of the imagination in poetry is asserted by Sidney (v. note 2, and cf. "Only the poet, disdaining to be tied to any such subjection, lifted up with the vigor of his own invention, doth grow, in effect, into another nature; in making things either better than nature bringeth forth, or quite anew.....freely ranging within the zodiac of his own wit." Accordingly, when we hear of "Arcadian chronicles", do we have a mere slip, or is Sidney barring out from poetry prose fiction?

[26] For extended discussion of unity of structure the reader should see chs. VII and VIII; of characterization ch.IX; of setting ch X; of style, ch.XI.

[27] Thus it will be seen that Defoe's attack in the preface to Captain Avery (1719) upon the inconsistencies of the pirate king's previous biographers, as well Swift's remarks on the "prevailing air" of truth in Gulliver's Travels were already old in theory. It is not within my province to discuss tricks within the

narratives proper-- those which are not necessarily conscious additions to the story, as are prefaces, etc. Yet there is a singular resemblance between Juquas Sadeur's attitude toward ordinary food after his return from Australia, and the much-admired repulsion of Gulliver by the "touch" of that "odious animal", his wife. (V. Sadeur, p.406, vs. Gulliver, Pt. IV, ch.XI).

[28] Cf. for this "truth" p.302, the account of some water-pipes; 309, on hares; 343, on fish; 349, on dogs obeying a queen..

[29] These tales are not really "gorgeous" in the sense of the partly genuine Persian and Turkish Tales, translated early in the 18th century by Petit de la Croix.. The Mogul, Peruvian, and Chinese Tales, e.g. are very tame (v.ch.XI)in style.

The confusing use of these terms can be made most clear through a comparison of the definitions of Furetière's dictionary with the usage of fictionists upon these points. Histoire or history, e.g., is defined by Furetière as "narration fabuleuse, mais vraisemblable, qui est feinte par un auteur, ou déguisée;" and lest the histoire should be confounded with other forms of fiction, Furetière adds: "Ce n'est pas un conte, un roman." Yet in 1624 Camus had produced what, according to modern standards may be called a domestic novel-- Histoire, Histoire Germanique; in 1647 Gerzan wrote the Histoire Africaine, which is certainly a long romance, deeply influenced by the Greek novel; in 1653 Valrenède asserted that Sarrasin was not a romance, but a "history," by which he meant that it was "history", as we today understand the term; between 1671 and 1700 Mlle. de la Force brought out her Roman de Gustave Vasa, and her Histoire de Marguerite de Valois-- both that we may call historical novels. Nouvelle or novelle or novel fared little better than histoire in France, far worse in England. Furetière defined nouvelle thus: "une histoire (!) agréable et intriguée, ou un conte plaisant un peu étendu, soit qu'elle soit feinte ou véritable." Unhappily this definition does not fit the content of either Cervantes's Novelas Exemplares (1613) or Sarasin's Moral Events (1637?); it does better for the "novels" included in Scarron's Roman Comique (1650). Then, too, what of the Contesse de Mme. de Villedieu's Annales Galantes? As for England, here confusion was trebled and quadrupled. In England appeared in 1685 the Loves of Ingender and Sabina-- something almost deserving the name of a novel as we use the term, and calling itself a novel. Only the previous year appeared Theodora and Didymus, an "historical novel," and in the same year appeared some of the "novels" of Mrs. Aphra Behn-- which are to be placed under various rubrics. But the most astounding use of the word "novel" is that to be found in an English translation of Mme. d'Aulnoy's Prince of Carency; the volume is described by the translator (1734) as "containing a variety of entertaining novels." Upon examination, these "novels," ten in number, turn out to be incidents in a romance of the type of Scudéry (1650); indeed, it requires some ingenuity and patience to tell where each of these "novels" begins and ends. (Cf. for a similar use of "novel" Mrs. Barker's Lyrilla (1715). Of roman, the third term we are considering, Furetière seems sure: "maintenant il ne signifie que les

livres fertiles qui contiennent des histoires (! d'amour et de chevalerie, inventées pour divertir et occuper des désœuvrés. Son ouvrage est plein de choses utiles et instructives." Yet Montesquieu in 1727 calls his Temple of Gnide, a semi-poetic prose description of Greek emotional life, a "roman;" and in Fontenelle's satire of 1731, the Prince des Commentateurs, both Prévost's Cleveland and the earliest novels are still termed as "romans." ..... After all, if the confusion was so much to the fault of first definitions, is not one born often into novel, romance, and history? I should not like absolutely to classify Zayde (1670), La Princesse de Cleves (1678), Gil Blas (1715), Clarissa (1748), Roderick Random (1748), The Long Vacation (1781), etc.

2

This distinction of Courtney's is by no means new. It is present in the Dissertation sur la Nouvelle (1734) and that to the Roman Bourgeois (1616). The was, indeed, more or less in the air. Moreover, it will not hold at all for some forms of the romance.

3

During the seventeenth century and the early eighteenth I have found five important treatises upon prose fiction; I fancy there are others. The Traité des Romans does not distinguish between types of fiction; though we have praised the discussion of the aims of fiction, it offers no more help. The 200-page preface to d'Aubignac's Macarise (1664) has been and will be referred to from time to time. Sorel's Bibliothèque Française (1664) wisely outlines only two types of fiction of the period; it has no general definition of romance. As for the treatises of Huet (1670) and of Camplet-Lafreney (1734), these will be found analyzed at some length in ch. V.

4

Some placed Lyliums and Arcadias among the historical chivalric romances, because it seems more influenced by these than by Sorel and Scarron. In the classified bibliography will be found the names of other chivalric romances I have

searched for theory. Saynier (pp.177-196) gives other names for France before 1660. Collier in his Bibliographical and Critical Account of the Rarest Books in the English Language gives an interesting analysis of some late chivalric romances unknown to me.

5

Alexandre, ed. 1667, t.I, p.1227. There is no particular point in Somerville's later remark (1830): "then for the end of pleasing you, I am to render myself capable of order, of patience, and of a conclusion."

6

Gregory Smith, Elizabethan Critical Essays, intr., p. VI. Nashe's words are (Anatomy of Absurdity, p.16): "that forgotten lavtanary license of lying.... the fantastical dreams of those exiled abbey-lubbers, from whose idle pens, proceeded those worn-out impressions of the feigned no-where acts of Arthur of the Round Table, Arthur of Little Britain, Sir Tristram, Huon.... with infinite others."

7

V. the preface to Perry's edition of the Princesse de Cleves, p. 24.

Cf. the eight Letters of Nicols in 1683. For English editories v. also Burton, Anatomy of Melancholy, ed. 1621, pt.II, section II, member 4; pt.III, sect.II, member 2, sub-member 4. The curious reader who wishes to judge the prose chivalric romance for himself in one of its purest examples is referred to the Palmerin of England, Vol.I, p.87; 155; 444; II, 102; 121; 217; 277; 287; 294.... Scarron's words bear out the suggestion that the satirists had no real moral reform at heart (Roman Comique, II, p.58): "I immediately set myself about reading the best romance-writers I could find, having rejected those of the Chevaliers, Ouert the Devil, Amon's four Sons, the Fair Queens, John of Paris, etc., which are trifling compositions, and only fit for children."

9

Cervantes, we should not forget, had been preceded by Chaucer in the Tale of

Sir Thopas, by Rabelais, and by others. V. Rabelais, Vol.I, p.[illegible], where prior [illegible] slays with his staff [illegible] pen, "besides the women and little children." Cf. Vol. I, p. [illegible] seq.

8 But v. in regard to Bonnerville's attitude ch. [illegible], note 45. Cf. Alexandre, ed. 1677, t. V, p.[illegible]: "Although the rigorous laws of the heroic work do not at all reduce composers (artisans) to give a reason for the marvels that they invent... and principally when they make them happen in a time so remote from theirs, or in countries so unknown.... always I wish through supererogatory work to show the truth of a thing which I had a design of rendering only vraisemblable." Cf/ further the preface to Alexandre, t.[illegible], and to Vol.III of Artheree, against all these stands Bonnerville's practice, and the careless defense of the portraits of Alcidiane and of Cydaris upon the Turkish tapestries (Alexandre, t.7, p.1381): "I do it despite my knowledge of its being forbidden by Mahomet."

19 Don Quixote, Vol.II,239 seq. The claim of the "truth" of chivalric romances is satirized in the preface to Vol.I; in Vol.I,1,21;[illegible] 74;133;137; Vol. IV,18, etc.

11 This importance of the supernatural is the result conveyed, I think, to every reader of Don Quixote. I add a tabulation of the way in which satire is used. Nine times the folly of romance in general is assailed (I, 25;55;137;[illegible]239; II,19;74; IV, 276;271). On the other hand, 39 times, omitting all repetitions of a reference to something supernatural mentioned before, Cervantes attacks the supernatural-- the enchanter as a person, enchanted castles, peoples,and journeys, an enchanted balsam, head, sword, helmet, phrase, etc.

12 V/, e.g., the Introduction to Huon of Bordeaux, E.E.T.S.,extra series 40.

I have already suggested that Cervantes remarks upon "probability" are to be taken cautiously ([illegible]). In determining his actual view upon the improbabilities of romance, it is necessary to consider not only other comments than those in the Don Quixote, but Cervantes's practice. And even in Don Quixote we have to consider the laudations quoted on our p. 59, the expression of admiration four other times ( ), and the preservation of some six volumes from the holocaust of ch. V. Among the volumes preserved are the wild and immoral Amadis of Gaul (the original four books), the Palmerin of England with its numerous enchantments, and the Diana of Montemayor, the entire plot of which depends upon the love-potions of the sage enchantress, Felicia. But let us consider some other remarks of Cervantes. He is the author of the Galatea (1584) and of the Sigismunda and Persiles (1617). The first was his "darling," and of the latter he wrote in 1613 in the preface to the Novelas Exemplares: "After them, should my life be spared, I will present to you the adventures of Persiles, a book which ventures to compete with Heliodorus." What are these books? The Galatea outdoes the Diana in introducing at the close a physical Muse (Calliope) [illegible] amid the shepherds. The Persiles and Sigismunda is fairly hit off by a scene from bk.I, ch.14. Here we are introduced to fair Rosamond linked in chains to a Juvenalian English poet-- the English translator gives him the name Rower+- and this at the court of the ruler of Greenland, whither a prince and princess of Denmark (?) have fled from the pursuit of a Polynesian barbarian with a Peruvian name! Are we not warranted in rubbing our eyes and wondering if the Cervantean canon is not corrupt? Unfortunately, we have Cervantes's own admiration for these most "probable" tales.

14

Later assaults add somewhat to this satirical expression of the theory of the chivalric romance. A more direct-- and more clumsy-- enemy than Cervantes was Charles Sorel, of whom we shall have more to say. In Lysis (1627) he included in Bk.VII a tale which, in Bk. XIII , we are told is a burlesque of the chivalric romances. Sorel satirizes dreams (Bk.IV), amulets (Bks. I;VIII), and monsters (bk.II)-- this, naturally, in addition to much Cervantean matter of ridicule. As an example of his

method may be selected a jibe at tree-carving (I.4.): "These are the greatest ornaments of our romances; and you shall commonly find those that cut satire odes upon trees, though there would be much ado to write a sonnet. A man does not so ordinarily meet with barks so large and proper, and the most can be done is to grave some character or little emblem.... the reason of this is (the authors') own stupidity, which makes them not consider those things that continually present themselves before their eyes; and because they who went before them said that lovers write long discourses on the barks of trees, they are easily carried away to put such things into their histories, for want of other invention." The Diable Boiteux of Le Sage (1707) has in its satire one new point (p.302): "She is a reader of romances, her head full of ideas of chivalry. She has a dream pleasant enough: she dreams that she is empress of Trebizonde, that she is accused of adultery, and that all the chevaliers that present themselves to maintain her innocence are conquered by her accusers." Cf. pp.9-10; 188; 189. In Prince Fan-feredin are satirized for the first time bridges that arise at one's wish (p.29); the power of music over rocks (XI); fountains of love and hate (30); hippogriffs (I/4). Outside of the realm of fiction the most pertinent comments will be found in Boccalini's I Ragguagli di Parnasso (1612), Secundo Centurio, paper No. XIV.

The magniloquent praise of variety of material in Don Quixote, quoted on p. 59, n. the structure of Persiles and Sigismunda, and the preface to Vol.II of Don Quixote all militate against these words of praise for coherence.

Prince Fan-feredin, p.184. The travellers into Arcadia find (178-179) the "Archives of Arcadia," a most inelegant building: "The portal, which is as large as the body of the building, is adorned with strange pillars of no order.... the body a pile of stones heaped upon each other, without either taste, order, or connection."

Furetière, in a passage of the Roman bourgeois (p. 43), aimed at all romances, gives as a cause for length the wish to gain money. A hit at length also underlies the words (p.): "I suspect that at this point there will be no reader who will not say to himself: here is a poor romancer! This history is not very long or well-plotted (fort intrigues). Bah! he concludes a marriage at once, and one is not accustomed to make it until the end of the tenth volume."

Practically all the romancers of other schools than the chivalric pointed out the lack of form in this ancestor of their own works. For a moment we may sum up their opinions in a quotation from Huet's Traité sur l'Origine des Romans (1670), p. 84: "Monsieur d'Urfé was the first who retrieved romances from barbarity, and reduced them to rules in his incomparable Astrée."

Cf. Sorel, Bibliothèque française (1664), p.156: "Histoires fabuleuses des anciens chevaliers qu'on a toujours faites du genre merveilleux."

The following brief analysis of the Palmerin of England will afford additional material for checking up this theory. Volume I deals, for reasons connected with the action of the earlier romance, Palmerin de Oliva, with the inveigling of numerous knights into the castle of the giant Dramusiando, that worthy's overthrow and conversion to chivalry by Palmerin of England, and the departure of Eutropa, a relative of Dramusiando, vowing vengeance. Volume II, after the death of the wicked Eutropa, introduces us to Miraguarda, a proud princess whose shield is protected by Dramusiando and others; the shield, however, is stolen by Albayzar, son of the Soldan of Babylon, and partly through complications arising from this, partly through the seduction of Targiana, daughter of the Great Turk, by Florian, brother of Palmerin, the Great Turk declares war against Constantinople, whose ruler is Palmerin de Oliva, Palmerin of England's grandfather. Volume III traces two great adventures, one of Palmerin and

one of Florian. Volume IV treats of the war against Constantinople, the fall of that city, the death of most of the knights of the generation before that of Palmerin of England, the marriages of fourteen couples of his day, etc. At the close the princes of the coming generation are all in the invisible isle with one Alidrie, a mage. In addition to the main actions there are many episodes. A few other points are illuminating. The apparently non-moral air of the author allows the greatest of latitude in such princes as Florian, while throughout all the work is a running fire of cynical remarks about women. Enchantments are not particularly stressed until Volumes III and IV; innumerable tourneys occur; a pastoral note is touched once (II,73); and there are few letters or harangues, and no poetry. As for the structure, the opening is fairly rapid, while the love of Palmerin for Polinarda gives the narrative more coherence than would seem possible from the summary above; the end, too, is decisive. An interesting note is the constant dancing. The setting is not altogether bare, the style is rather commonplace save in the stilted love-speeches, and the characters are wooden. But these are fully treated in ch. IV.

All chivalric romances which I have seen are told in the third person save Du Verdier's La Diable de Verre (1584), which is autobiographical.

21

This is not the place to discuss the survival of the chivalric romance. In the seventeenth century it remained as a form to be imitated longest in England. The Parismus, the Pantelion, and the Ornatus and Artesia of B. Ford had a long run of favor (v. Miss Morgan, p. 6); but these romances were of the "purified" and "made probable" type. For instance, enchantments are limited to the power to "cast asleep," -- a genuine power; and Pantelion has no giants, Parismus but one (bk.II,ch.6). Some other English romances, however, such as the Led-Love Knight (1640), the Knight of the Sea (1660), and the Flower of Fidelity (1658) are packed with marvels. A second influence to be reckoned with is that of supplying episodes in other types of romance; v. d'Astrée, pt.I,bk.I (episode of Les Ténébres), pt.III,bk.I, tr. V, bk.I (Fountain of Love). The wood of horror in Polexion (1631), bk.II, and the bleeding myrtle

t. IV, canto VI, lines; but the ring of infidelity is [illegible] by this. It seems [illegible] the chivalric romance. [illegible] there is a distinctly chivalric tournament in the [illegible], as well as an underground palace (influence of the [illegible]), and in 1553 [illegible] found a public for a continuation of [illegible]. Quite aside from their literary influence, the people who seem to have admired the chivalric romance offer material for speculation. I merely append some stray notes. We learn from the Butler [illegible] that a favorite boy "had very much turned his studies, for about a twelvemonth past, into the lives and adventures of [illegible] of Greece.... and other histories of that sort." Taylus (1737) translated and edited the old romances, as did Florian (1787) and Southey (the Amadis, 1803). Mr. Johnson read selinserts of Tyrannia through [illegible]'s life, Vol. I, p. 18). Sous can know many words (Confessions, t. I, Bk. IV, 18). In 1879 Geo. W. Curtis "liked" the Amadis. My own investigations have revealed to me that at every Italian book-shop in Chicago one can buy editions upon editions of I Reali di Francia and Guerrino il Meschino in unchanged form; the demand is steady.

22

Even in the Liland [illegible] romances are important enough to get much space. Felicia carefully distinguishes them from the shepherds. Bk. VIII sep. is almost entirely heroic.

23

Said Boileau take this from Sorel (Lysis, Bk. I): "It is thus that several have undertaken a romance, expressly to find rules for their old poetry." Sorel does not mean D'Urfé.

27

Giants appear in the Amadis, pp. 167, etc. And we read of [illegible] "a monstrous beast of most ugly shape, named him a Princesses, etc." Bk. I of the Amadis was much used by Sidney.

25- The forces of the time, which produced the Astrée are summarized by Deyoier in his Introduction, pp.VI-VII. D'Urfé's effort is considered the culmination of a genre of "sentimental" fiction, due to the fascination of society from 1610 on, to a love for preciosity "never surpassed and inexplicable by foreign influence," to the interest in Platonism as reflected from Italy via Castiglione and others. At various points in his work he indicates the literary influences on the likes of Montemayor (tr.1578), the Cercel d'Amor, the Greek novels, Petonic poetry, and the obscure works which he has investigated and given a bibliography of. One may add, perhaps, that d'Urfé's early work, the Sireine, is undoubtedly influenced heavily by the Diana. Other influences still lie, it seems to me, in the pastoral drama and in the tragi-comedy, or d'Urfé's own words (e.g. 67) mean nothing; and, of course, in the Amadis. I am inclined to believe that Sidney's Arcadia was never borrowed from until the appearance of the Argenis (1621) and the translation of the Arcadia by Baudoin (1624).

26 Again I should set Boileau's words in the Discours against d'Urfé's theory and practice, feeling sure that the scales will tell in favor of the romancer. Boileau writes: "the moral tone (morale) was very vicious, preaching only love and softness, and going so far sometimes as to wound modesty a trifle." Cf. the preface to Tome II of the Astrée, in which d'Urfé playfully inquires of Belsadon why he hides from his mistress from time when all Europe not only knows his abode, but would laugh at his scruples. "Do not say," he warns, "that love can never be without respect and obedience.... that the pains and the torments which you suffer are only the glorious witnesses of your perfect love.... Ah, shepherd, how the age in which we now are is contrary to your opinion."

27 V. ch. IX, p. , for d'Urfé's words. Cervantes is adapting from the preface of Montemayor's Diana.

29 refers to Book IV, 1627. This idea of a 'dramatic' division of the action seems to appear first in the title of the Bergeries de Juliette (1585), where the mention of it, however, may be due either to the influence of the Decameron or to that of Sannazaro's Arcadia. Still, the days in the Arcadia are more than five. The passage in the Bergeries de Juliette runs: "In which through the loves of shepherds and shepherdesses one sees the different effects of love, with five jocose stories told in five days by five shepherdesses." Dramatic terms, it must be remembered, were constantly used in the Greek novel (V. Rohde, p.479, note 2). The same practice is common in Sidney, Deloney, Greene, Lord, etc.; cf. Champion, D: "The Pains and Fortune, dallying a woeful catastrophe to make a pleasing epitasis..."

30 Sorel's Bibliothèque française gives a list of allegorical romances. I may add that on the first pages of a 1641 edition of Du Vrai et Parfait Amour a [illegible] allegorical key. By an "animally personal" allegory I mean one which has no other purpose than to "reveal by concealing" the author's own affairs; the Endymion, e.g., relates the love of Gombauld, the author, for Marie de Medici, and is told as a vision of the awakened Endymion, who has lain asleep upon Latmos.

31 D'Audiguier's Lacedaemon (1664), "an abridgement (!) of the philosophy of the Stoics," mentions, in addition to its 200-page account of the allegory which is to come beyond this generous preface, "l'invention, les intrigues d'amour, les événements extraordinaires.... (ne) rien que de grand et de delicat.... les petites aventures.... des interruptions agréables....des ornemens." Cf. the preface to Dodona's Grove (1645).

32 Not after the morality-play pattern, except perhaps Madiromnes (Philip III).

33 The Argenis seems almost equally indebted to the Greek romances and to the Arcadia (v. the immuring of Argenis, p.212, the peasants' revolt, 46, etc.). The characters (v. ch.9) are intendedly disguised by the use of non-historic actions-- a fact which accounts for the discrepancies of"keys." Other feature not expressed in

Barclay's theory are the lack of supernatural elements, the employment of a fairly unified but most incoherent plot, the insertion of a long comic tale (Alf ency.) and much verse utterly alien to the content of the narrative, and the use of Eucyprus (Barclay) as a spectator-poet, like an ancient chorus. Urfe in the preface to his English translation (1623) complimented the Argenis for having "that true trade, as to the loss of time and corruption of manners, these romances are for the most part stuffed withal."

33 In the Don Quixote appears a pastoral element, the purpose of which is not clear (v. Vol.I, p. 98-100 -- satire?; II, 272; III, 111-164; IV, 156-159). The Dons' Colloquy (Novelas Exemplares, Vol.II, 164) has this passage: "All those books are dreams well written to amuse the idle, and not truly to all, for how there been so, there would have been some trace among my shepherds of that most happy life and of those pleasant meadows, spacious woods, sacred fountains, lovely gardens, clear streams, and crystal fountains, and of those lovers' wooings as virtuous as they were eloquent, and of that swoon of the shepherd's in this spot, of the shepherdess's in that, of the bumpie of one shepherd scoundrel here...." Cf. cf. IX.

34 The Argis, though once very popular both in France and in England (tr.1604), is little known today. The hero, Argis, a reader of pastorals and the ward of a respectable Parisian merchant, falls absurdly in love with Charite, a waiting-maid of no great beauty, turns shepherd for her sake, and, accompanied by Carmelin, a French Sancho Panza, passes through a series of ludicrous adventures at St. Cloud and elsewhere, until, like the knight of La Mancha, he gains "a free and clear judgment, and nothing overshadowed with the misty clouds of ignorance" (Don Quixote, Vol. IV, p.271). But while Cervantes brought about the death of his hero (probably through fear of non-Cervantean sequels), Sorel allows Argis to wed Charite, and Carmelin Isette.

Of the attitude of Sorel toward his satire Breton expresses a common opinion,

when he says (147): 'Sorel spoke in the name of common sense.' For myself, I must own that the views of Charles Sorel are more serious in their wrongness than those of Cervantes. Let us look more closely at both the _Polis_ and Sorel's prose productions. In the first place, about 1614 Sorel, under the pseudonym of the Sieur de Vaux wrote _Alcidiane et Clarymare_, and _Clorie et Clidamis_ by, if not these, as Roy (430) in his _La Vie et les Oeuvres de Charles Sorel_ admits, _les Amours de Clidamor et de Cloriste_ - which is quite as extravagant. It is true, indeed, that in the preface to _Francion_ (1622) Sorel seems to regret these works of 'little judgment,' and that in the _Bibliothèque Française_ (1664) he dismisses both _Alcidiane_ and _Clorie_ as 'of little value and little elegance'(p.158). Pass these volumes. In 1626 Sorel wrote _l'Orphise de Chrysante_, more of a chivalric romance than the 'real novel, it purports to be; in it we find an old-fashioned tourney (ii.111), a nasty history of Venus (i.1), marvisms and love-philters (ii.47), an oracle(ii.1), etc. Since 1626 was the year in which _Polyxis_ was being completed, dating (Ba.11), .50 suggests that the _l'Orphise de Chrysante_ was a pot-boiler. If so, was it for this reason also that Sorel finished the Sieur de Molière's _Polixène_, which itself is rudely censured in the _Polyxis_? It rather looks, at the very best, as if Furetière's portrait in the _Roman Bourgeois_ (i.ii) of one 'Charroselles,' who wrote 'only to sell,' were faithful enough in one trait; and at the very worst, as if Sorel had no literary convictions at all. But pass this matter, too. That of the fact that Sorel's _Bibliothèque Française_ (1664) speaks of the _Astrée_ as an 'ouvrage fort exquis' but one which has been criticised merely for 'somewhat of the incredible, in making shepherdesses and shepherds talk and act with the greatest good breeding in the world.'(156). That, again, of Sorel's admiration for the later romances, the _Polexandre_, the _Cassandre_, and the _Artamène_, so lavishly lauded in his _Usage de Romans_ in 1639? If next we turn to the _Polyxis_ itself, its machine seems in every direction strikes us as curiously suggestive of uncritical bitterness. Of the five inserted tales in the volume, one is aimed against Gril's _Ethnophrasie_, one against the pastoral romance, one against the chivalric romance, one against Straparola's _Facetie Notti_ (1550), and one against the _Ingenieuse Héroïne_. Moreover, such a miscellaneous group of personages falls under

his times as Lessart, Lafayette, Isabeau, Pitt, Fox, Burke, Clarkson, the author of Salathiel and Waverley, Wilberforce, and— all the philosophical Whigs. If, as may fairly be granted, the contents of the Will represent Lord's views, he is indeed a creditable Anti-Slaver. The greatest space in his screed on Negroes and Christians is spent in arranging chaos for interrupting Chesterfield, who is relating a many-houred story— a parody of Scheherazade, incidentally, which forms in his Technique of the Novel also a parody of Richardson (p.37). & the entire nothing more is here said than that the romance is badly named for a minor character, that Lyons is a fool, that Lyonnaise is super— a Satanist, and that the chronology is incorrect.

36

Cf. the preface: "If that be to the credit of the proposal in itself, of furnishing materials, to whom we really and in fact found a romance as they this age hath brought forth, you see it hath been very fortunate in it, and though they have given the name of romance to those charming and delightful histories, and that this pretends more right to the title, as being nothing but nature and delight itself, you would have called him then [illegible] romance, but that because romances contain nothing but fictions, whereas this must be thought a true history."

36

Lyons, p.37. A parte part of the letter: "Love having taken your beauties for arms, had long since laid a siege to my liberty, which was retreated within the fort of my reason, when, either willing himself to the trouble of a scalado, he is fled into my eyes and by them he entered, as a torrent carries into a house through the windows." Cf. the obscure autobiography of Mrs. Lee's novels.

37

[illegible]

35
All these quotations as far as the ending of p. 7 are from the end of the lysis.

39
See the Greek Indicate more definitely

40
The history of civilis- (Ulmann counts two million 2 words wrong. For the public use Cahiè is also required : unity of time, Lagni in ... : unity of place, and Corbeyrière in 1670 call calling. The literary quarrel is ... (Ulm can be as early as 1674 on, 1687) culminates in 1871. In so far as unity of time, Interno (1668) and Comical (1671) imported 1 year. Just how this theory passed into ... romance is not known. The results of Amyot's (1572) version would ... the indefinite length of time; the ... usage is the cause of the error; the ... Colette alleges in fact says (v. note 8, actually two or one year); the ... usage to the shores of the Ligur. ... not until Aigremont is any definite theory stated (1681).

41
... theory is further ... in Du Perier's ... (1637), in the ... Scudéry's ... not ... (but printed), ... in ... (1700), pp. 47-... According to ... (1671), the ... of Pasquier of ... (1611), is a satire. ... counting has not seen the book, and from my own ... borrow comments on the work ... statement very ... the child ... Leonard ... in his ... and ... page. The ... V ... (1660, in one ... dialog, ... the evil ...

42
The ... of Ligur has only ... (1717, ...

43
... lists of these romances are in the bibliography. The ... text omits

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

1 My bibliography, although my list is limited to those romances which I have personally examined. Javotte, the heroine of the Roman bourgeois (1666), reads all the best romances, including the Astrée, in eight months-- since she neither eats nor sleeps; my own rapid reading of the Grandmaire in Rotherell's translation took 24 hours. Nevertheless, a number of the romances are complete in two volumes; some few, especially after the publication of the Zayde (1670), in one.

2 Les Amours d'Armide is apparently a prose paraphrase of the Jerusalem Delivered. Armide's father is a magician, and she a Britomarte; Godfrey of Bouillon starts upon a crusade; etc. Les Amours d'Cesiras opens with Theosante, princess of Trebizond, offering her hand to whoever can recreate Troy. Sigismund, emperor of Greece, undertakes the task.

3 Gerzan is the author of the Histoire Africaine de Diocède et de Polonisse (1627-1628) and of the Histoire Asiatique de Corinthe, d'Italiphe, et d'Artémise (1630; permis 1633). Baudoin produced the Histoire Septentrionale (1631) and Inquisitoire (1638). La Tour Rotman published in 1636 Histoire Celtique. All these writers have detailed prefaces; Gerzan's seems fairly honest, to judge from his narratives. I cite the chief contributions to theory. All three writers speak of the use of history. Gerzan writes before the Histoire Africaine: "Now there remains nothing more to point out save that in this manner of writing I have attached myself to some rules (particularités) which few people have observed, principally to exact geography and to true history.... one would have no way of convicting me of falsity." Baudoin declares that the Histoire Septentrionale is not "a fabulous invention, but a veritable history, which Octavio Finelli, Gentleman of Spolette, assures us he had from a Caloyer Greek, as he voyaged along the coast of Epirotus." La Tour Rotman chooses "to make use of the time (faire une application).... between the first and the second Punic war." These three writers also emphasize probability (vraisemblance). In

Gerzan v. n. 11, note . La Tour Hotman is very explicit: "there has been no departure from the bounds of probability (vraisemblance), either in the actions of the men or in the movements of Nature (efforts de la Nature)." But this statement is presently qualified in true Scudérian fashion: "Whatever of their ancient fashions of living has been found too crude in some passages, of this there has been nothing (Que s'il s'y trouve trop rudes en quelques endroits leurs anciennes façons de vivre, il n'y a pas manqué de leur pouvoir)." In yet another portion of the preface we read: "But there has been no neglect, above all, (in the representation) of their government, their customs, the depiction of their appearance (la constitution de leur corps), or even the condition of their clients (le gouvernement de leur clients)." Other important comments of these authors are those of Gerzan in relation to structure, and those of La Tour Hotman upon the source of the heroico-historical romance. Gerzan speaks thus (preface to Histoire Africaine): "There is no one who will not own to me that several things are requisite to the composition of a romance, the knowing how to make a fiction (invention) in seemly fashion, judicious disposition of material (economie), and coherent plot (narration bien suivie). Along with this it is necessary that there should be much complexity of plot (beaucoup d'intrigues), often so devised as always to hold the reader in suspense (on the alert-- en haleine?), and so cunningly interlaced (bien mêlées) that one can not retrench them, without breaking the thread of the narrative." La Tour Hotman says (preface to Histoire Politique): "In order to render the reading more agreeable he (the author) has followed a mean between the Thebaneas of the Aethiopica and the Argenis of the learned Barclay.... the poem (sic) of the one is not heroic enough, and that of the other is too devoted to politics (trop politique) and too serious."

Some words may be added upon the Histoire Africaine, which seems to be the first of the heroico-historical romances. Jehan (Les principales Oeuvres) p. 642, note 1, is in error when he attributes this work to Mlle. de Scudéry; but he is following Leo Scholvius in his Lexicon Universale Deutsch-Lateinischer Scribenten. The date (1627) which I have given is that of the first edition of Part I. But possibly Sorel has Gerzan in mind when he writes in ch. XIII of the Berger Extravagant: "that in

my judgment there they were all begotten in the romance of Heliodorus; and the sheers of Venus in the preface to Argenis (which also goes far to earlier date (v. p. 73 for these remarks). As to substance, the opening pages, wherein we see a beautiful young man and woman who have just been shipwrecked upon a lonely coast, certainly recall the Theagenes and Chariclea; and as we advance, we meet reminiscences of Calligone and Euclyo, Anthia and Perilaus, etc. Still, there is much in the first lines of the work that suggests Sidney's Arcadia (tr.1624). I fail to see any close following of the Aethiopica of Heliodorus -- a source accepted by Lobb (p.434) on the authority of Aholevius.

4 My chapter will deal almost entirely with French romances. For some discussion of the Elizabethans in England see Miss Morgan's Love of Wonders; for fuller treatment of this type in Germany v. Aholevius's Leipzigerdichter Romane des 17ten Jahrhunderts. I have found few Italian romances of this type and no Spanish. Prefaces which occur are slavish imitations of French prefaces. The English romances, moreover, differ from the French mainly in a looser structure, a less chaste tone, and more homestic language; the former in a remarkable predilection for the periods of Christian persecution. The prayers are given variously.

5 But the love-motif of the Joseph-and-Potiphar's-wife variety is, as Koerting suggests, not uncommon and is often all-too-vivid. Cf. The speech of Astyages, quoted in ch. II, p. .

6 Both Calprenede and Chic. de Lonbery make a slight use of the supernatural. V. in Cassandre (Lotterell's tr.) the stone Tyrope, p. 6; the fountain of tears, p. ; the magic bars, 771; and the water of Nonacris, 822. But the water of Nonacris is from Plutarch (Koerting, Vol. I, p.234). The ghost of Caesar appears be-

before Augustus as a King of Numidia in Cléopatre, t. VI, pt. II. Similarly in Mlle. de Scudéry's Artamène we meet the ring of Gyges. Mlle. de Scudéry knew Firmian's Lydius Gellius, 1537, republished before 1663.

7

V/ further Loerting, Vol. I, p. 242 seq.

8

What part Georges de Scudéry had in the Scudérian romances need not concern us. The architectural descriptions may be from his pen or from hers in imitation of the Du Vrait et parfait Amour (1569), criticised in the preface to the Ibrahim. I can not agree with Breton that the entire preface should be attributed to Georges.

9

Only four conversational débats appear in the whole of the Cassandre (Cotterell, 45; 59; 183; 341). On the other hand, Mlle. de Scudéry published from 1680-1692 five stout little volumes of "conversations", many of them transferred without alteration from the pages of her romances.

10

This Cléopatre is the daughter of Antony's famous paramour.

11

The reader should recall the use in fiction of technical dramatic terms (ch. IV, note 28); d'Urfé's view of "parts" as acts (p.67); and Sorel's sneers at oracles (p.73). Von Waldberg, pp. 173-174, misses much of the first (!) announcement of the unities in fiction-- in 1637 .

12

The time of Cassandre seems to be about one month; of that of the Cléopatre and the Faramond I am uncertain. d'Aubignac's Macarise (1664) definitely aims at

this unity: "In order to limit this history to the space of one year, as the good rule of [illegible] in verse or in prose desires.... I have followed the ordinary structure of these works and have cut the life of my hero into divers parts, of which I have made several (reverting) recitals" (pp. [illegible]). [illegible] (p. 121), we read: "The tragic dramatists.... whose works are only romances of a day, as the epic poem of a year." Corneille, one remembers, yielded to the unities in 1636.

13 Pt. VIII, bk. I, p. 7. Cf. also Barthomissa (1688) and Tullius (1715) in England.

14 The life of Orosmanes occupies nearly all of Pt. I; that of Lysimachus most of Pt. II, bks. 1 and 2; that of Thalestris Pt. II, bks. 3 and 4; that of Berenice part ii, bks. 5 and Pt. III, bk. 6; that of Semanis, including especially her love for Orocndates and her machinations against Statira, Pt. III, bks. 1 and 2; that of Artaxerxes Pt. IV, bks. 2-6; that of the princesses Statira and Parisatis after the loss of their lovers, Orocndates and Lysimachus, Pt. V, bk. 1; and that of Orontes Pt. V, bk. 2.

15 The episodes are the tales of Alcione and Cleomedes, Pt. II, bk. 6; of Demetrius and Berenice, Pt. III, bk. 3; of Leimmat, Pt. IV, bk. 1; of Barsina and Orontes, Pt. V, bk. 3. These are mainly reverting narrative. One should note that the refuge found by the princesses after their flight from Babylon is with Alcione and her father, and that Barsina's life is closely interwoven with the fates of the important lovers.

16 It is well to recall that historians proper "romanced." W. Walton's Hyperaritica (1618), Address the First.

17 Cf. Segrais's preface to _Zaïde_ (1670): "these (history and fiction) are two lights which in place of effacing each other.... shine through the brilliancy of each other;" and d'Aubignac in _La Pratique du Théâtre_ (1657): "the author is not obliged to follow it (history), he can not." D'Aubignac cites the precedent of Homer and Virgil for profane history; sacred chronicle (p. 141) must not be altered.

18 _Clélie_, pt. VIII, pp. ; _Clélie_, pt. III, pp. 1370-1434. The first of these discussions, and the longest as well as most significant, will be found reprinted verbatim in Mlle. de Scudéry's _Conversations sur divers sujets_, Amsterdam, 1685. In ch. VI and its notes I have made some strictures upon the enthusiasm of Von Faldberg in _Der Einfluss der Lehre in Frankreich_. Accordingly, I must point out here that in one of his outbursts (p.) he sees in this reprint from 1684 a proof of his interpretation of the new spirit in fiction from 1670 onward. He writes: "Ist es aber auch nicht rein theoretisch konstruiert, man merkt deutlich, dass ihr bei den meisten Bestimmungen die zeitgenössische Produktion vorschwebt hat, dass sie also empirisch gefunden sind." After this, one may well trust Von Faldberg's constant abuse of _Clélie_ and other romances with caution.

19 The preface to _Ibrahim_ passed into English in 1668, into German, 1682, into Italian, 1684. The preface to Chevreau's _Pamphilie_ (1644) is almost a copy of that of _Ibrahim_.

20 Bussy-Rabutin's _Histoire Amoureuse des Gaules_ (1665).

21 Here Scudéry parts company with La Fayette: "I am to tell you, readers, that here virtue is seen to be always recompensed, and vice always punished, if he that hath followed his own unruliness hath not by a just and sensible repentance obtained

grace from heaven' (preface to Ibrahim).

22

Cf. preface to Ibrahim. 'Neither have I put anything into my book which the ladies may not read without blushing.' Personally I like to think that the tale mentioned in an apology before Ibrahim is by Du Cleins or Scudery: 'And if you find something not very serious in the histories of a certain French marquis, which I have interlaced in my book, remember, if you please, that a romancer ought to have the knacks of all natures.... and at the worst regard it as the sport of a melancholic soul suffer it without blushing it.' I may add that the gay tale here referred to, Bussy, so we are told, from the Italian of Passarli, was later appropriated in large part by Mme. d'Aulnoy as the Prince of Carency (1697), and turned up in English form in 1684 with some alterations (v. ch. I).

23

Clélie, pt. III. Tome I, alone of Clelie contains religious scenes, pp. 112;274;285. the last is a huge description, essential, however, to the plot. In all the Cassandre and in such parts of the Cléopatre and the Artamene as I have read there is nothing like this.

23

Breton, Le Cœur de Mme Clélie, p. 176, quotes from Artamene on musing 'confession' yet in the mouth of Mandane, the much-suffering heroine: 'In truth, when I review in my memory all that has happened to us, and then after so many seductions, so many persecutions, so many wars, so many shipwrecks, and so many misfortunes.... I avow that my intellect is in confusion.'

24

These matters are all explained in the preface to Ibrahim. Upon unity of time we are told: 'to confine themselves within reasonable bounds that (the romancists) have

make the history (as a likewise have done after them) not to last above a year, the rest being delivered by narration." Upon occasion he said: "They have not done like those painters who present in one and the same cloth a prince in the cradle, upon the throne, and in the tent, perfecting by time so likely judicious a conclusion, but that considers their work; but with an incomparable address they begin their history in the middle, so to give some suspense to the reader, even from the first opening of the book." As to the conditions, events by the portraits we make. "Thus the marriage of my Curiosity and his Infidelis, being the object which I have proposed unto myself, I have employed all my care, as to do, that all the parts of my work may tend to that conclusion; that there may be a strong connection between them; and that, except the obstacle which fortune opposeth to the desire of my heart, all things may advance, or at leastwise endeavor to succour his marriage, which is the end of my labor."

26

A portrait as material entirely extraneous to the narrative v. the preface to Clélie, Tome I. An architectural "ornamente" v. the preface to Cyrus and text to Clelinde (quoted ch. 3, p.). As Logan's translation of Clelia is twice nearly four large folio pages (48-9) to portray a Roman palace, etc.

27

Cf. preface to Clelia: "But amongst all the rules which are to be observed in the composition of these works, that of true resemblance (so-called) is without question the most necessary; it is, as it were, the fundamental stone of this building, and but upon which it can not subsist; without it nothing can move, without it nothing can please; and if this charming deceiver doth not beguile the mind in romance, this kind of reading disgusts, instead of entertaining it; I have thereon taken a power to resign myself from it, and to that purpose I have observed the manners, customs, religions, and inclinations of people; and to give it some true resemblance to things, I have made the foundations of my own historical, my fancies [illegible] such as are marked out in the true history for illustrious persons."

28

The doctrine of [illegible] was, of course, to remain in the sixth, fifteenth, and thirty-fifth chapters of Aristotle's treatise. As early as 1554 it appeared in the form of [illegible] with Lauretanus (1554); but Piccolomini (1565) admired the marvellous in the Aristotelian sublime. Segni (1549) and Castelvetro (1570) developed the theory. Tasso (1587) is quoted last [illegible]. The question is [illegible] as to how it [illegible] these claims. To [illegible] that it was in one [illegible] or another voiced by Jonas and Corneo (1612) cannot (v. p. 67), and that the theory was fully grown by 1561. Even the [illegible], in certain ways, of Att., [illegible] the title text of Scaliger's [illegible] (1567) to which reference might be kindly called (v. the [illegible] and [illegible] Critiques of the [illegible] reading in the "Lyon Lucretius" volume, pp. 78-80). And [illegible] the point to the [illegible] in Scaliger's [illegible] (1561). In this I can only oppose the lying preface of [illegible] (1558), for no other early [illegible] seem to [illegible] the matter; and the general light for probability, [illegible] Aristotle, e.g., seems to me not to [illegible] with such speed that much of the Renaissian theory could not have been borrowed from the theories of drama and poetry. I do feel, however, that the [illegible] to [illegible] irrelevance of [illegible] to [illegible].

29

Cf. Lucian, preface: "Those untruth takes no [illegible] in the soul, for gives any delight or [illegible] but recall it to conduct it to the misfortunes of the queen of Amazons and the king of [illegible], because I know that these things are not in the universal way, or, in my belief, in the [illegible] of things; but this is not the only defect that may carry us from the true resemblance [illegible], but we have at other times been ravished, [illegible] we wonder, to think it to be so miserable; their nature is showing too much [illegible] have been overpowered, which have not a little of the vitiate of [illegible]; but one might demand of these [illegible] with [illegible] that if ever it [illegible] of Priam, after it had read his [illegible], [illegible] Lucian [illegible] [illegible] is for me, I hold that the more natural adventures are, the more satisfaction they [illegible]

30 Mlle. de Scudéry's books open with gorgeous events detailed with an eye to color and sound-- Tarquin, e.g., with a triumph at Constantinople, Artamène with a conflagration, Clélie with an earthquake, and Almahide with an uproar in the streets of Granada. Cf., however, Mlle. de Scudéry's vividness with the dull pomp of the opening of Cythère (quoted p.).

31 This advice in its most literal sense was followed by a whole school after 1670. The most important works are Mme. de Villedieu's Les Exilés (167), Mrs. Barker's Exilius (1715), and Mrs. Rowe's Noble Lovers (1722).

32 Mlle. de Scudéry gives another reason, which now seems of little importance: "Now for fear it may be objected unto me that I have approached more incidents nearer than the history hath shewed them to be; great Virgil shall be my warrant.... I have believed that I might do of some months, what he hath done of so many years." Cf. the preface to Ogle's Artamène (1691), and the notes of Scott to Quentin Durward.

33 The chief are three: Hesiod is made the author of the hymn which is being sung on the beach to Neptune, "because this species of work is sufficiently characteristic of him." This hymn, not another, is sung, Because "there seems needed an extraordinary motive, like that, to carry the people to that extraordinary action" (the destruction of the brothers). The omission of the dog is thus accounted for: "this people would have been very thoughtless, to have torn to pieces two men, merely because the dog of Hesiod had thrown itself upon them."

34 Cf. chs. I and . for the significance of these statements in Scudérian practice. The "plaire docendo", it must be remembered, was of force not only in

romance, drama, and poetry, but in painting. V. the description and picture of Clovis in Dupleix's Histoire générale de France, as quoted by Jusserand in The English Novel in the Time of Shakespeare, p. 304. Mme. d'Aulnoy as late as 1724 in the Comte de Warwick, Vol. I, p.44, writes of a picture of the Comtesse of Devonshire (period 1477), which is palmed off by a character as that of Fair Rosamond; then the deceiver says: "s'il trouvait la draperie trop moderne pour être de ce temps-là, il lui dit qu'il l'avait habillé a la mode pour s'en plaire mieux." Von Waldberg, it seems to me, is again inconsistent in abusing Mlle. de Scudéry, and then praising Mme. de Villedieu's theory before Les Exilés (1677): "I augment them my history with some secret interviews, and some amorous discourses. If they are not those which they (Virgil, Ovid, etc.) have pronounced, they are those which they should have pronounced." On the whole, I hope the discourses (v. ch. IX, p.) were not those common in 1677, as Mme. de Villedieu hastens to tell us. Ovid and Virgil, incidentally, were not new in fiction (Waldberg, pp. 348-349). They had appeared in Cléopatre, part IV, bk.7.

-xxii-

The practice will be touched upon later in some of its phases. Boerting and Breton give excellent ideas of the incidents of Scudérian romance; the latter's short list (p. 180) comprises respectful abductions, recognitions, reunions in distant lands, resemblances, and disguises. Another element, of the source of which I am uncertain, is the prophecies, such as Hesiod's dream concerning the future of literature (Clélie, Pt. VIII), the list of the kings from Faramond to Louis XIV (Faramond, pt. II, bk.1).

-xxiii-

The chief satires upon the heroic romance are Molière's Les Précieuses Ridicules, Boileau's Héros des Romans, Bougeant's Prince Fan-feredin (1735). One of the aims of Scarron's Roman Comique and of Furetière's Roman Bourgeois is satire directed straight at this school. Not satirical is an imitation of the Decameron by the

Abbé Bulligny, which appeared as La Fausse Clélie (1670); the heroine has had, before the story opens, a series of adventures which seem to her so like those of Clélie, that she has intervals of insanity, wherein she thinks she is Clélie. But this fact is not used to ridicule Clélie, and the false Clélie scarcely appears after the first 30 pages. Of the other works mentioned, practically all of the satire of Molière and Boileau falls upon characterization, setting, and style; and that of Scarron is better put by Furetière. This leaves for analysis the Roman bourgeois and Prince Jean-Firadin.

Furetière's attack upon unity is his most significant stand. Besides this, his explanation of the length of the romance, and Bougeant's words on conversation and on the "historical cloak" will be quoted. The attack upon unity has been cited in ch. III, p. ; Furetière carries out his principles admirably. Part I, e.g., relates the adventures of Javotte, a bourgeoise who has a series of lovers: Nicodème, who falls into disfavor, because a seduced girl, Lucrèce, unjustly accuses him of her betrayal; Aldout, an old miser; and Amerace, a précieux. With Amerace she finally flees, while Lucrèce becomes a devotee. Part II drops all these people, and recounts the loves of Charrosailles (Charles Sorel) and a woman-lawyer, Collatine. The two finally marry, are divorced, and are lost sight of in a law-suit. As for the length of romances, Furetière states four main devices for securing "la longue haleine"-- story-telling, abductions, portraits and verses, and unity of place. (The first three of these devices are employed by him ad nauseam). It is, he tells us, an important rule of romance for each character to tell a story; that is why squires and confidants flourish. ("Know that this linking of intrigues one with the other is proper to these heroic and fabulous poems, where one can cut and prune at his sweet will"-- preface to Pt.II; cf. Boileau's Cyrus, who begs Pluto to "permit that I go to hear the history of Aglatidas and Amestris," and also Prince Jean-Faredin, 72-73; 95-99). In the second place, come the abductions. ("You are only a trifle versed in the reading of the romances, or you ought to know 20 or 30 of these discourses by heart, if only you have a little memory. They are so common that I have seen people who, in order to mark the place where they were in a history, would say: I am at the eighth abduction in lieu of I am in the eighth tome--p.

204). In the third place, come the portraits and verses. (V. Roman Bourgeois, the tale of Angélique, in Vol.I, pp. 151-182, wherein [illegible] this (p.166) is Mlle. de Scudéry, and also the account of the efforts of Bellastre to make himself a poet by drinking Hippocras, Vol.II, p. ; cf. the tablets of Thomyris in the Héros des Romans, and the cryptograms of Lucrèce and Brutus, ibid.) In the fourth place, comes the doctrine of unity. ("In order to avoid yet more the beaten path of others, I wish that the scene of my fiction be mobile, that is to say now in one quarter, now in another of the town"- Roman Bourgeois, Vol.I,p.28; cf. I,208: "by an evil custom which has long reigned in the romances, all the personages are prone to encounter each other unexpectedly in spots the most distant, whatever route they may take, or whatever differing design they have;" also the preface to Vol. II: "do not demand at all that I observe either unity of time or of place").

Of conversations Sorel writes (Prince Jean-Forcadin, I.61): "these are like finely-woven threads of lace or net-work;" and of the historical claim (p.124): "This lack of probability makes me admire the precaution which one of the Arcadian modern annalists has taken, to prefix to the beginning of his history, an argumentative preface, to justify, very seriously, the facts he relates; as if we knew not that in quality of Arcadian annalist, he had privilege to say the most improbable things, without any one having right to find fault with him." But this may refer not to Calprenède, but to the Abbé Prévost, whose prefaces we quoted in ch. III, pp. .

37

Production of the heroico-historical romance practically ceased after the Faramond (completed by Vaumorière, 1670) and the Alcidiane (1668 seq.); indeed, the only true representatives of this school after 1670 seem to have been the Eromena (1683), the Agistis, Reine de Sparte (1685), and perhaps the Celenia (1723). Surely, however, Von Waldberg is wrong when he views both influence and popularity as vanished by 1664. Such works as Sandras's Mémoires de la marquise de Brusne (1685), Mme. d'Aulnoy's L'Hypolite (1690), Mrs. Behn's Oroonoko (1688), Mrs. Barker's Lucius (1715),

and Mrs. Aubin's Noble Slaves (1722) are saturated with some one or other of its characteristics; and the problem of the relation of Scott or even of Richardson to these romances is a pretty one. As for popularity-- the chorus of praise is steady and the indications of constant reading evident until far in the eighteenth century. The story of Condé's holding a tome of Cassandre while he fought may or may not be true; but it is certain that writer after writer mentions these works as the food of the adolescent. (V., e.g., Mémoires de la vie du comte ....., Tome I, p.9; The Sisters, ch. I -- in Novelists' Magazine, Vol.5; etc.) But I prefer to pass over all such references, and likewise such testimony as that of Scaliger (

), La Fontaine (

), Mme. de Sévigné (

), Crébillon père (

), Rousseau (Confessions,

). Rather, I select in France the attitude of enemies between 1650 and 1670, and in England only the works of Dorothy Osborne, Lewis, and Mrs. Anne Thicknesse. Sorbière's portrait of Mlle. de Scudéry as Sophie in his satirical Dictionnaire des Précieuses of 1660 (Vol.1,p.214-215) is flattery itself. Sorel, as usual, may be caught between the fires of his inconsistencies. In the Connaissance des bons livres (1671) he writes of himself: "The war which he had declared upon d'Urfé and his contemporaries, he has rewaged against Calprenède and Mlle. de Scudéry; he has ridiculed these books, interminable as twine or twist (comme la corde ou le matte), which one can elongate without limit, adding always hemp or straw." But in the L'Isle de Portraiture, a professed satire upon "portraits" (1659), he had said: "no one in our century has better succeeded in these matters than a brother and a sister, illustrious for their excellent works, wherein they have each their part, (and) in which one sees ingenious portrayal (portraits) of the bodily person, the qualities of the soul, manners, and of all estates of mankind (toutes les conditions des personnes), as also their dwellings and their offices, and other matters so precisely..... the humours of the majority of persons who are there introduced are succinctly depicted." And Sorel's Bibliothèque Française (1664) reverses (p. 164): "they have surpassed other nations, which could not display works of such coherence (grand ordre), such agreeable invention (invention), and such beautiful language." The Abbé de-

grais has also been considered by some as an opponent of the romances; and in his preface to the Nouvelles Françaises (1656) he does say: "The great changes for the worse which others have sometimes made in historical truths.... these manners entirely French which they give to Greeks, Persians, or Indians, are things a trifle remote from reason. The end of this art being to divert by conceptions vraisemblables and natural, I am astonished that so many brilliant writers (gens d'esprit), who have imagined well-bred Scythians and generous Parthians, have not taken the same delight in imagining French chevaliers or princes equally accomplished, whose adventures would not have been less pleasant." On the other hand, Segrais also writes (preface to La Princesse de Paphlagonie, 1659) that his Princess of Paphlagonia is not that of Mlle. de Scudéry, "because to undertake the same thing as she does not become me; it would be most ridiculous; and, however great is my self-love, my reason prevails upon it to such an extent that I am assured it will not blind me to the point of letting me make such stupid faults."

So much for France. In England Ignora Addison's Way of Fashion, Pope's endangered heroine, etc. But the sprightly Dorothy Osborne is so wrought up over Gomberville's Alcidiane that she is angered at the heroine; five times she mentions with high esteem the Cléopatre (Letters to Sir William Temple, pp. 64;64;76;77;98); seven times the Artamène (ibid. 111;113;114;152;177;[illegible];[illegible]), once the Ibrahim (ibid 164), and of the Cassandre (ibid. 161) she has read four volumes and "like so far as I had seen of it extremely." Boyle's Parthenissa of 1654, one notes, strikes her as "affected," and objectionable in that the women "court" (ibid. 237). As late as 1715 Lewis, translating Huet's Traité de l'Origine des Romans, utters the wish "that some English genius will dare to naturalize romance into our soil." Similarly, in 1780 Ann Thicknesse in her Sketches (80-81) Women of Letters has this to say: "Her (Mlle. de Scudéry's) works are written with great spirit, but now quite, in the bad style.... one particular advantage, being all founded on facts.... her narratives too prolix, her descriptions long, and by reciting many, the most trifling matters, she has lengthened her stories.... but her conceptions are noble, her reflections just, and she displays uncommon ingenuity."

Yet, were all these comments to go for nothing, what would have been the point of such satires as Berquond (1714), La Nouvelle Calestris (1736), Fables Pan-Foredin (1735), The Comic Quixote (1762), if no one knew the originals? Let me own at once that I prefer the Cassandre or the Clélie to Grandstark or Chun Neighbood Gas in Flower. All four works outrage my reverence for 18th-century vraisemblance. The first two were written by gentlemen.

38

Cf. Lewis's translation, pp. 42; 46; 57; 74. I do not quite agree with Miss Morgan's admiration for Huet's criticism (p.).

39

Huet's entire discussion rests upon a distinction between the evil "Milesian Tales" (p. 27), and the exemplary and apologetical fables, such as Aesop's, etc.

40

Huet gives at intervals the names of "regular romances" and puts most of them in a list on p. 34. Very properly he bars out Lucius of Patres and Apuleius, writers who collected stories about enchantments and apparitions. But when allegories are denied entrance to the "regular" ranks, one wonders what becomes of Barclay, etc. One is also a bit puzzled by the statement (34) that the Barlaam and Josaphat and the Daphnis and Chloe might "easily" have been "reduced.... under these laws." Last, when one finds among the "chosen" not only the Theagenes, the Clitophon, the Astrée, the Cassandre, etc., but also the Wonders Beyond Thule and the Babylonica, one gives up. To make the Theagenes and the Wonders Beyond Thule fall in one category of fiction is to square a critical circle.

41

"One of the great beauties of our modern comedy" (64).

42

The preface to the Sieur ..... D....'s translation of Clitophon and Leucippe in 1734 has a charming but essentially untrue exposition of the chastity of French taste in literature.

43

Where under feigned names are represented the loves of the King and Queen of England — prefixed to Galerie. Histoire véritable, et de beaux — preface to La fille supposée.

44

V. the Histoire de Gallien, Roman Bourgeois, Vol. I, p. xxii-xxv.

45

Called by Morel's Bibliothèque dramatique (p. 153) the first of its kind. Cf. the Roman Royal, xxvi.

46

Of this I know nothing save the account in Prince Ama-Zeroela, p.

47

As to the "more," the reader should not forget the growing importance of the picturesque tales, the novels of manners, the letter-novels, the voyages imaginaires, the contes des fées, all flourishing in many sub-species. In Theroye's Air Boiling Flutter, (V. Morus, p. 222-224), we read of the diversions of Brussels, 'very necessary to be read by all old ladies who are desirous to improve themselves at questions and commands, Blindman's buff, and the like fashionable recreations.' Is this yet another offshoot of the heroico-historical romance, with its conversations? The date is 1678.

noy lays down laws for the writer of fiction. That there are such laws he is as positive --in ironical fashion++ as was Huet: "Should one fail in one or the other; one renders himself unworthy of being read by those who do not at all wish to expose themselves to danger" (196). There are, he continues, five faults to be avoided, four virtues to be sought. These we may reduce to five canons. First, religion and morals are not to be offended, although in their defense neither allegory (200) nor inserted was digressive discourses (201) should be employed; instead, "caractères avantageux" and "portraits lively and touching, yet noble and modest" are to be drawn. "faiblesses de coeur" may be depicted, if with due restraint. In the second place, no author should dare to treat with satirical disrespect the peccadilloes of a King, a prince, a minister, a favorite, a magistrate, or a disgraced person. The "loves" of a prince may be handled delicately, it is true, for (for) "it is well-known that princes are not marble statues." Third, the structure of the "roman" allows episodes, although episodes are not to prevail upon the principal action either in dignity or splendor; a beginning in medias res and a termination in one or several marriages (198) are necessary. Fourth, vraisemblance must be observed--i.e., a roman must deal with every-day events thrown into by unexpected occurrences, unless the subject should exact a treatment based "more upon our manners than upon the gout of the nation depicted." Fifth, the roman should be written "avec esprit," a requisite which seems to mean (216) that one portray "people polished, polite, amiable."

Dufresnoy closes his volume with an historical survey of fiction, more elaborate but no more searching than Huet's. The Chinese and Tartars, for instance, arouse Dufresnoy's wonder because they who are so "phlegmatic" (307) have no long romances. Of translation of Dufresnoy's work I find no trace, though it is referred to in Bishop Percy's Reliques of Ancient English Poetry in a note to

48

"I find virtue in those expressions which strike at that good breeding, modesty, virtue are not always so rigid or so austere as one thinks" (p.180).

47

"there is often as much peril in a virtuous act of rudeness as in a secret and well-hidden fault" (p. [illegible])-- surely an unanswerable argument for the reading of fiction; that it will teach us in practice virtuous rudeness!"

60

Though there is little novelty in Dufresnoy's theory of romance and other forms of fiction, I append an analysis of the L'Usage des Romans, because of its rarity and because of its interest in connection with my next chapter. Dufresnoy's platform (p.7) is to consider only those volumes "which treat of a wise and moderate love, conducted with all the decorum which polished manners demand, and which .... only represent under feigned names the ordinary course of human life, and draw from it salutary instructions." Naturally, then, he later bars the from treatment (130) Amarillo, Numan d'Alfarache, the Roman Comique, and Gil Blas, because, even though these are agreeable," they have "neither dignity of subject, nor majesty of appearance (personnes), nor loftiness of the characters." Still later (205) the Greek novel, the chivalric romances, and the fairy-tale are condemned for lacking vraisemblance. A long definition of a romance (roman) Dufresnoy never gives; from various passages a definition may be framed by the reader. Let us deduce, accordingly, this: a "proper work of fiction" is a poem in prose (35), written in the service of morality and poetic justice (2[illegible]4, of distinct length (49), with a single main action ([illegible]), showing only noble characters (153), and treating only [illegible]ful love of a heroic type (294). [illegible] single main action episodes are not debarred. By the law of noble characters a writer (189) ought to prefer the bastard of a prince to the legitimate child of a prime minister. By heroic love is implied (230) the exclusion of Platonic affection, (237) homosexuality, (160) and love for one's wife or one's paramour (252)

Sometimes in accord with and sometimes in violation of this definition Dufres-

1 The unsatisfactory nature of even this definition is clear from a consideration of Barclay's Euphormio (1619) or Privas's Marianne. The Euphormio relates the adventures of a boy just arrived into our world from some Utopia where money is unknown. The names of the characters are Greek. Magic healing is made use of in Pt. I, ch. I4. As for Marianne, she is certainly of picaro ancestry-- but as she climbs from obscurity to a countess's seat, she is scrupulously honorable.

2 As usual, theories of characterization, setting, and style will be found in ch. IX, X, XI.

3 As far as I know, the earliest rogue-tale in England after 1650 is that in the Nova Solyma, Vol. , pp.

4 Cf. Defoe, Robinson Crusoe, preface: "In a word, the adventures of Robinson Crusoe are the whole scheme of a real life." The opposite development to that of Mr. Badman is seen in Gil Blas and in the Comte de Belcour (v. p. 31). The reader of Defoe's Colonel Jacques feels that from the beginning the hero is vaguely at variance with his environment. He slowly rises to a higher plane.

5 Cf. D'Assoucy's Aventures Burlesques d'Assoucy (1677), preface; also Furetiere's Unlucky Citizen (1671), preface. It is observable that, after the first chapters of the Memoirs of Grammont, the story moves chronologically-- from Trino to Turin, thence to France, thence to England. Yet, on p. 167 Hamilton writes: "It is allowable to drop the thread of a narrative, when real facts, not generally known, give such a variety upon the digression as to render it excusable."

8

The reader should not forget the service of some of the picaresque writers in attacking the "moral" digression (v. p.22, and Ch. 2 in ch.4). The picaresque tales worked out a theory of the comic proper to their aim; this is treated in ch. VIII.

9

The works of these writers stand almost alone in the European fiction of their day (1620-1650). They are worth serious study in many ways to most readers of The Rover's Holiday. They are [illegible], they deal in [illegible] trivia, they are far better pictures of [illegible] than the over-polite novels of France. Their unique note is the exaltation of the bourgeois. (P. ch. 1 and 2, pp. [illegible].

10

In one sense such pleasure tales as Lubrecin and Francion might be called novels of manners. Francion, e.g., tells us: "The true comic history ought to be only a lively painting of the diverse humours (humeurs) of men." Sorel's later preface to Polyandre (1648): "Le vrai Théâtre comique doit être les naturels vifs de la plupart de leurs défauts." Indeed, Francion comes to grips with its satire the court, the nobles in capital and province, the bourgeois, the peasants, the thieves the prostitutes; and it grew from seven to twelve books. Koerting accords it frank admiration; Arnton points out (p.82) that the pictures of the court can not be called accurate.

11

The story deals with the loves and adventures of a theatrical troupe. The scene is most often in Provence. The third part is not by Scarron.

12

I should be inclined to attribute to Scarron's influence the appearance of a "[illegible] [illegible] en [illegible] Contes," a [illegible] novel (or short-story?) of 111 pages by C. le Petit - the L'Heure du Berger (1662). It is dedicated to

Monseigneur, Monsieur, or Cassire Crotchet Ironicski. It narrates how a gallant on his way to an assignation with one for whom he had long sighed in vain is met by a coach, carried off by two "incognitas" for "l'heure du berger," introduced into a picturesque old mansion, led by delectable chit-chat into a confession of love for one of the incognitas, and then-- overcome by the revelation that his forgotten lady-love and the unknown are one and the same. It is pleasant to note that the lady is forgiving.

[11] Cf. Diable Boiteux, pp. 94;95;199;313;328. I am inclined to see in this work the hint for the machinery of the New Atalantis of Mrs. Manley (1709).

[12] The Cervantean novelas and the vision-fictions of Quevedo are to be taken into account during all the latter half of the 17th century. To untangle all the lines which were meeting at about 1760 is a hopeless task; Miss Morgan in her Novel of Manners, pp. 82-85, has done pioneer work for England. There is nothing upon this particular problem in either Koerting or Kroton. On the whole, Miss Morgan's assumed attribution to Lysander and Sabina (1688) of the honor of being the first "novel" in England seems to me justified. If Mrs. Behn's Black Lady is really of 1683, it can, even then, claim no more consideration than an "anecdote," and all the other works before 1688, which I have examined, seem to me novelle or romances-- except certain "historical novels."

As to the source of such works as Lysander and Sabina, Incognita, etc., I do not agree with Miss Morgan. She considers French influence problematical (p. 85, note 30). I have no doubt that the fictions which she cites from Reynier's Le Roman Sentimental Avant l'Astrée were unknown in England. On the other hand, I have read a 1684 translation of La Calprenède's Cleonice and Cassandra-- a tale quite upon the order of the humorous novels of manners, so rapidly acclimated in England from 1688 on.

[13] Cf. Mémoires de la Vie du Comte d'.... (1696), Vol. I, pp. 89-90.

6. For the title as verisimilitude in the sense of irrony cf. [illegible]

7. The story runs thus: The young gentleman of Amor, Aurelius and Hippolito, attend a carnival ball at Capraneo, Hippolito in the dress of a recently-wedded lord, Lorenzo. Accordingly, one of the heroines, Leonora, mistakes Hippolito for Lorenzo when she arrives to meet a[illegible] lover, while at the same time Aurelius falls in love with the fair incognita. Aurelius tells Hippolito, however, that his name is Hippolito, and, shortly afterward, Hippolito writes to Leonora, signing himself Aurelius. Presently Aurelius' father, in order to close a deal with the Lord of Viterbo, agrees that Aurelius shall marry Viterbo's daughter, Lucina. Later still, an unknown lady comes to Hippolito, asking for Hippolito, i.e., for Aurelius. But while Hippolito is searching for Aurelius, the visitor leaves, giving no trace of her identity save a half-destroyed note, which reports Hippolito (Aurelius) to meet her at a convent--- [illegible] Hippolito stumbles upon the proper convent in time to save Leonora from a[illegible]; he learns that she is in trouble, and persuades her to wear a veil in his presence. Hippolito, meanwhile, has found out and escaped, and, after a[illegible] of fury, her father makes the best of his son-in-law. It occurs to Hippolito to close with the revelation that Leonora is the betrothed Lucina. Irony, I suppose, sees in the"180 pages"or the Incognita an effort toward the short story (cf. The Short Story, p.). Even though the number of pages is really 87 (mid-[illegible] is the numbering), I can not see the point of calling this [illegible] an effort at the short story. I refer the reader to Irony--- an unjustifiable process from the point of view of the reader.

8. As probable ---and as improbable--- as those of the [illegible] comedy.

9. On p. 37 the time is carefully computed, "which is a very remarkable circumstance"

[illegible], p. 3[illegible], mentions some early "historical novels," such as La Mariane de Richmond (1716) and L'Amour d'amour (1735). I have not seen these, but they seem to have been merely without influence.

[illegible] of these are of 1671. The Hero or Destro of Lisbon [illegible] seem to have been written in 1670, but were unpublished until 1750. That date is significant, when one recalls the much-heralded discovery of the English Conquest (1682). My own edition of L'Eyolite, Conte de Anglie (1690), is "nouvelle" (perhaps the fifth), one of 1764.

2.

The Cid Orrins, for instance, is a small volume of 174 pages; the Comte de Chemis has 240; Marie Stuart (1675) is in 2 volumes, each of 230 or so pages; Tudor, Prince of Wales, has 330; L'Eyolite 384; etc.

3.

Short and terse tales of history appeared in England at least as early as 1680; v. Miss Aspyn's account of the Earl of Essex and Queen Elizabeth (p.56). But, though I have read this "novel", I did not consider it more than a novella, and denied the title of "historical novel" to any English work before Tudor, Prince of Wales (1678), until I read Miss Aspyn's memoirs of English Adventures (1676). I gladly push the date of the "first historical novel" in England back two years.

Tudor, Prince of Wales is so [illegible] that I give a summary. The opening pages briefly discuss Tudor's years till Henry IV. Deposed, Tudor seeks the court of Charles VI of France, where, despite his misfortunes, he is loved by Catherine the princess. She, however, is being sought both by Henry V of England and, less openly, by the Duke of Gloucester. Partly through the latter's jealousy of Henry, and partly through a pretended courting of Madame de Jaick by Tudor, Catherine holds back from the hated union. Unfortunately, a letter written by Madame de Jaick to Burgundy, whom she loves, is delivered to Catherine as though it were intended for Tudor. Her rage induces her to accept Henry; and Pt. I ends. In Pt. II Catherine, after the King's

death, secretly married Tahir. After the birth of three children the Sultan's [illegible] Tahir's secret is discovered by the jealous Roxelane, she flies in Tahir's arms and is separated. The use of an introductory [illegible] the oriental settings— is noteworthy.

Apparently the [illegible] Leti's romance, for von Hellwig [illegible] Histoire de Perse (1694) by Guilli. Leti's story similar [illegible] or as I should judge from the brief account of von Hellwig. The latter does not mention Leti's work.

[illegible]

The heroic-historical romance (cf. I. XLVIII) still exerts influence, of course. For instance, it is seen in the unmistakable tales of amorous [illegible] which are as well placed here as anywhere, since they were written from 1731-1748 and deal with events from 1700-1713. Aside from translations, she is the author of the Life of Duc de Beaufort (1738); Adventures of Count de Vinevil (1738); The Noble Slaves (1740); the Life and Amorous Adventures of Lucinde (1722); and Fair Amy (1726). These are crosses of the heroic romance, the [illegible], and the novel of manners which sometimes [illegible]. All open historically; all have introductory tales related by someone who happens into the area of the story or happens; all contain letters, and all, fortunately, [illegible] verse; all have incidents dealing with shipwrecks, life on desert isles, flight to [illegible] caves, etc.; and all are correctly given in time, which at times permits lurid [illegible] of the "horrible example". In [illegible] at most unknown castles— a half century ahead of the Gothic school, and is only [illegible] Gothic note is strong. Cf. further also Morgan, pp.[illegible]; the source to [illegible] mention of the Life and Amorous Adventures of Lucinde, however.

I have already shown that this sort of work was not new in tendency. Valincour, in Lettres sur la Princesse de Cleves (1678), savagely asserts that Mme. de Lafayette borrowed from the Marquis de Chermes' Les Désordres de l'Amour; but the charge is rejected as insubstantial by Charnes in his immediately-following Conversations

sur la Critique de la Princesse de Clèves, p.xxi.

Prévost is not referring to shipwrecks, conflagrations, pirates, etc., but to interference with political affairs and to fearful deeds done under the pressure of overwhelming passions: "But when one has successively passed through all the degrees of good fortune and of adversity, when one has felt the extremities of good and of evil, of grief and of joy, one has been proved, so to say, and this mixture distinguishes....heroic characters?" (l'Avis de l'Editeur to Mémoires d'un Homme de Qualité). Prévost also prefers the bizarre, whenever he can; thus the Mémoires originally ended (v. note at close of Tome II) with the death of Selima, the Moorish wife of the hero, and his consequent investment in arms all dressed in black, wherein he sits contemplating without cessation a golden casket which encloses Selima's ashes. Did the Gothicists overlook this? V. for Prévost's power over the terrible the rapid murders which end the unhappy loves of the Marquis and Madine (Tome VI, pp.45-64).

The 'truth of history' is rather a French dress, I feel. Still, I agree with Miss Morgan, p.30, in admiring the work (her date, 1721, is in error). As early as Mme. de Lafayette's Princesse de Montpensier we read (Oeuvres, Vol.II, p.450) that merely to behold a beautiful woman of rank upon an unknown river is 'romantic': "This adventure gave a new joy to these young princes.... it seemed to them une chose de roman." Ramsay in his educational romance, The Travels of Cyrus (1727), writes: "History simply relates facts as they happen, without endeavoring after the intrigues, speeches, and surprising adventures of romance." Crébillon, before the Comte de Meilcour (1735) enumerates the features for the novelist to avoid "Turks, harems, eunuchs, and sudden death."

The most astounding example of this compression is in Theodora and Didymus,

in the preface of which we find a page or so of synopsis for all the first Volume of the story; we are told that it was once written in full, but has been lost! A 1635 translation of Don Enriquez de Castro "cuts from the details concerning the Italian wars." V. also note 20 to this chapter.

17

The plot is this: Theodora has been condemned as a Christian to exposure in the stews of Antioch. Didymus, her lover, flies to her in the disguise of a Roman soldier. She, fearing the unknown arrival, begs death at his hands, nor is she persuaded to flee in Didymus's garments until after much persuasion. She takes refuge with a friend, Irene. Nevertheless, when she hears of Didymus's condemnation, she repents of her weakness, and offers her life for his. The two now plead in public that each may die for the other-- a wish unexpectedly realized by their double execution at the hands of the President of Antioch, who is most wroth that either supposes he could save the other. Miss Morgan, p.8, in mentioning this work, seems to be tracing it to Barlaam and Josaphat's influence; it seems to me to have sprung from the admiration of Camus's work-- even though it is entirely different from his 1000-page Agathonhile.

18

e Comte de Warwick (1766). Alberte, ou la Reine de Navarre (1694).

19

The theory in the preface to the Annals of Love, 1672 (I quote Miss Morgan, p. 85) runs thus: "When the history of Spain tells me a sovereign Countess of Castile followed a poor pilgrim into France, I can not imagine things could run so high in a moment; they must see one another, they must meet, and discourse, before she could come to so strange a resolution. I have augmented the history therefore with several interviews and amorous dialogues of my own; if they are not what they really spake, they are at least what they might." I have not seen this work, but the title and the preface strongly suggest to me a translation from Mme. de Villedieu's Annales galantes

(Cf. p. [illegible]). If this is true, the speeches are mere gallantry of the Scudérian genre.

Theodore's sensitiveness and honesty are rather well done. The scene wherein the heroine borrows Lilyrus's clothing is pretty.(p.43). V. for further discussion of Boyle's theory of characterization ch. II, p.

Valincour in his attack upon the Princess de Cleves shows the power of the old theory of vraisemblance. It is not vraisemblable that the Princesse would, like any bourgeoise, visit a jeweler; that she would give her husband only a half-confidence; that she would join with Nemours in forging a letter,etc.

For Boccaccio v. p. 9; for Les Avantures de ...., p. ; for Mlle. de Scudéry, p.92.

The only adequate treatment of these"failures" is in Von Waldberg's Der Empfindsame Roman in Frankreich, a volume rich in synopses and quotations from the period which it covers-- 1669-1715 or thereabout. The literary development of the period is attributed almost exclusively to the influence of two works, thoroughly psychological, the Portugese Letters (1669) and the Princess de Cleves (1678). With this the reader may compare my discussion of other forms of fiction during this period.

I admire Waldberg's work. But I feel that his enthusiasm makes him a dangerous guide for one who has not a first-hand acquaintance with the books discussed. Waldberg, for instance, praises highly the productions of Mlle. Rocheguilhen, Mlle. Bernard, Mlle. de la Force, Mme. [illegible]isu, Mme. d'Aulnoy, and others. He finds (p.427) these qualities characteristic of their work in general: "Gestaltlos wogende Empfindungen, Reizbarkeit des Gemütes, krankhafte Stimmungen, unterquellendes Mitleiden, melancholische Weltbetrachtung, Zerrissenheit des Gemütes;" elsewhere (422) he says: "Und alle diese grossen Kunder gehen auf einen einzigen Kunder zurück, auf das Er-

wachsen der menschlichen Seele aus ihrer dumpfen Schlafe.... sie sind mit einem Worte empfindsam geworden." (p.31) Of the year 1691 he writes: "Nur mit Zärtlichkeit und Leidenschaft konnte jetzt noch das Sublime gelocht werden." Perhaps his strongest statement is (p.31): "Und mit der immer fortschreitenden Berücksichtigung der individuellen Melancholie erweitert sich auch ihr Gefühlsgebiet, und nicht nur die Gesamtanschauung und die Liebesempfindung, sondern auch das religiöse Empfinden, das Naturgefühl, ja selbst der Humor werde von ihr berührt und gefärbt." One may well ask, after these laudations, why Breton (Le Roman au 17ème Siècle, p.245) speaks thus of the same period: "In the degree that we advance toward the close of the century, we feel, by imperceptible touches (indices), that manners are corrupting and the moral sense dying," and why he contemptuously dismisses Mme. d'Aulnoy's L'Hypolite (1690), whereas Waldberg awards it high praise? The two points of view do not seem compatible.

Personally, though I think better of L'Hypolite than does Breton, I agree with his main contention. Waldberg is not a good investigator, and his terms are to be discounted. I have already pointed out (p. 171) his enthusiastic use in support of his interpretation of the period of a 1688 reprint from Clélie (1654). His view of La Fausse Clélie as a satire I have also corrected(p. iii). Nor did it need the appearance of Magnien's Le Roman Sentimental avant L'Astrée to convict Waldberg of rashness in declaring (p.) that the Princesse de Cleves is the first married heroine in European fiction. Sidney's Cynecia may not be in point. But what of Boccaccio's Fiammetta and the Marquis de Thermes's Désordres d'Amour-- the last within this very epoch, 1670-1680? Now, I do not wish to cite other startling enthusiasms in a book which I have read with interest, and to which I owe some of my quotations upon theory; but two things I feel it necessary to add. In the first place, whether or no the age was one of "melancholy" and "sentimentality", the greater number of the works I have read or skimmed seem to me to be, not sentimental, but sensual, and to err as far in the direction of shallow libertinism as the Clélie in the direction of formality. Indeed, to find "volupté" appearing no earlier than Les Amours d'Ovide et de Flore (1704) is not to allow due credit to the exemplarily indecent work of Mme. Villedieu -- to cite boldly one author admired by Waldberg. In the second place, the tears, the laments, the wailings on which Waldberg lays such stress can be paralleled from

ency of the heroico-historical romances which he accepts as worthless. In which volumes are the most effective lamentations I am not sure. On the other hand, I admit freely that even in the poorest of the "failures" there is awake a new spirit-- a pale reflex of the white-hot passion of the Lettres Anglaises or the tortured heroism of the Princesse de Clèves.

The process of the psychological or "sentimental" novel in France is fully detailed in Der Empfindsame Roman. The progress toward what was to be called the Gothic romance is woth a moment's attention. Death-bed scenes of no mean effectiveness occur. V., e.g., the death of the Countess of Devonshire (Le Comte de Warwick, 1764), that of Celie (Mémoires d'un homme de qualité, Tome II, pp. 147-152), that of the heroine of Gustavus Vasa (quoted in Der Empfindsame Roman, p.). Scenes of ghostly terror are not frequent; v. especially the scene in ... de Montcal, where Celie. Lisert opens the night with a corpse (quoted in Perron, Le roman au 18ème siècle, p. 129). The use of music to soften the soul is the most interesting phenomenon. I have not noted passages, but haidtes quotes from several novels (v. pp. 244; 299).

Before I saw Chrysolite, Koerting's praise of it seemed to me, from his synopsis, excessive (Vol.II, p.). As I read it, however, I altered my opinion; it is much to be desired that some one reprint it. On one point I can not agree with Koerting. He interprets the sub-title of Chrysolite -- Le secret des hommes -- as meaning that the author considers Chrysolite an example of the secrets of fiction-writing "as it should be." Marechal's own words hardly warrant this: "Sans retirer que le tout est une feinte; mais cette fiction touchera sensiblement, s'il veulent ne se feindre point, ny se desguiser à eux-mesmes, et pourtant que cela arrive, voyla le fruict et le secret de son roman, et celuy que tous les autres devroient avoir." Still, Marechal was fully alive to the novelty of his attempt. The modern reader is annoyed by a long inserted tale about the impossible princess Helione, but, if he turns to the preface, he reads: "I have still to say to you that, having proposed to myself to give a reasonable satis-

faction both to one and the other, in trying to satisfy the majority of courtiers, who would be offended at swimming in water which was not as lofty as the air, and who do not wish to read in a book any fortune lower than that of a prince or a king, I have joined to the private life of my Elytimen, the loves of the princess Heliane."

[illegible]

The tremendous vogue of the letter-novel before Richardson is still ignored. Reynier, pp.256-260, discusses the letter-novel before the Astrée. Thus Les Proprietez d'Amour (1651) has the story after the letters; Les Propheties d'Amour (1660) has the letters in the appendix. If these works are at all like the letters (some 53) given at the close of Les Amours d'Henri IV, they are mere exhibitions of gallant persiflage. On the outpour of imitations of the Portugese Letters Waldberg has nearly a hundred pages; Miss Morgan treats the English imitations with lamentable brevity (pp. 73-75; 75; 108). Aside from the emotional and romance-presaging letter-novels we meet letters used to convey criticism and satire (Lettres Persanes, 1711); to scatter scandal (A Collection of Original Letters from the Island of the New Atalantis, 1711); to extol a "voyage" (Letters...Each Journey to Exeter, 1725). I owe the last reference to Miss Morgan, p.86. Of all the tributes to the letter-novel and its popularity that before the Lettres Persanes (1732) is most instructive: "I fear indeed that the public is at length tired of the books entitled 'Letters'. One sees almost no other thing at the book-shops. Here are the Provincial Letters, there the Portugese, the Turkish, the Persian, the Jewish, etc. What more? Letters and always letters.... It is a terrible thing -- example, I have not been able to resist this torrent."

[illegible]

V. pp. 97-98. The French chronique scandaleuse needs no more attention. But of the English fiction of this type an important handbook (Cross, The English Novel, pp.20-21) writes thus: "To their contemporaries, they were piquantly immoral....They represent a conscious effort to attain to the real, in reaction from French romance. They are specimens, too, of precisely what was meant in England by the novel in dis-

tinction from the romance, just before midcentury: a short story of from one to two hundred pages, assumed to be founded on fact, and published in a duodecimo volume." In the face of such remarks it is well to trace the chronique scandaleuse into England. From the years 1705-1740 it appears in three great forms. The first is seen in one of the earliest important examples-- Mrs. Manley's The Secret History of Queen Zarah and the Zarazians (1705). Here we enter a fictitious land, where tailor ann[illegible]med names we encounter Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, etc. A better example of this form, wherein the supernatural is not introduced and which consists of intrigues more or less connected, is Mrs. Haywood's Court (not Count, as Professor Raleigh has it) of Caramania (1727). The confusion of heathen temples, 18th century love, Scudérian conversation, etc., leaves one with the impression of having endured a nightmare. The second form of the chronique scandaleuse appears two years after the Fable of the Bees. It is Mrs. Manley's New Atalantis (1709); Justice and Virtue meet on an island somewhere in the Mediterranean, in order to unveil a world lost to all decency; it is true Virtue takes a curious delight in dwelling --perhaps is agony-- upon sexual perversions, in transcribing letters between homosexual affinities, etc. Mrs. Haywood's Island Adventures is, so far as I know, quite surpasses the New Atalantis. The guide is Cupid, a being who has more right than Virtue to revealing the mysteries of "adepts in debauchery." In both these collections of impossible scandal there is no device for securing unity save the presence of the guide; the inanimate object does not seem to be used in England before Smollett's Adventures of an Atom. The third form of the earliest chroniques scandaleuses I know is only one example-- Mrs. Haywood's Lenny and Zeusay (1753?). Here two lovers, uncertain as to their "compatibility", rehearse each day tales of marital infelicity or happiness, apparently drawn from their daily observations.

But, no matter what form is used, it should be clear that the chronique scandaleuse is not "piquantly" immoral, is not an effort at the real, and is not a "short story" or a "novel", as the pre-Richardsonians understood that term.

[illegible]

On ethics v. p. ; on religion, p. ; on politics, p. . Mme. Villedieu's

Les Délices (1677; tr.1678) illustrates the *vin de simple* interpretation of love in the *chronique scandaleuse*. I quote without comment. "This, your manner of proceeding with David, said she to the princess, is as much opposite to the rules of love, as virtue; you suffer a person to expire at your feet, whom you love, because a little punctilio, perhaps, either of state or modesty, will not permit you to allow him the benefit of your mercy" (12). "If the lovely Delpheria, said she to her, could be capable of that condescension, as to content herself with the second room in a heart where the daughter sits in throne to the first...." (21). "And accordingly, more enraged against Orasmus, for the innocent attempt he had made upon the heart of his mistress, than the criminal one that he had formed against that of his wife" (241). Cf. pp. 26; 119; 147. V/ also for hints from Love the Island Adjacent to Utopia, Vol. I, pp. 53;54 and Vol. II, 3;4;10;[illegible]. Vol. I., p. 44, should be read in relation to the entire story of which it is a part.

[illegible]

...ut v. preface to Pt. III of the New Atalantis (partly quoted p.).

[illegible]

...n interest in Cervantes should perhaps be considered; the work is satirical. The [illegible] of Courtilz (1685) is thus prefaced: "The kind of discourse which I give to History is possible without procedent (*sic*)."

[illegible]

...n the use of the supernatural in the Island Adjacent to Utopia v. Vol. I, pp. 1[illegible]; Vol.II, pp. 3;12;[illegible]; 43 (travelling in the air); Vol.I, 164; Vol.II, 270 (carriages drawn by [illegible]); Vol.I, 118 (flowers from Cupid's tears); Vol.II, 272 (a monstrous form); Vol.I, 258 (Astrea as a *deus ex machina*).

[illegible]

...here are suggestions of the Gothic romance in the Island Adjacent to Utopia (Vol.I, p.171; II, 3;125).

On all these points v. ch. II and III. According to him, the voyage imaginaire is in the vein amusingly fantastic (Veiras,1672); romanesque (Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans la nouvelle découverte royaume de Frimezonde, 1663); philosophical (Voyage to the World of Cartesius,1692); personal (Voyage de l'Isle d'Amour); critical (Lucien de Tortaillure, 1683); scientific (Voyage dans la Lune,1656); pseudo-scientific (The Blazing World, 1666); reformatory (Les Aventures, 1675). It seems worth while to cite one more quotation, illustrating the general view of vraisemblance (consistency) in 1734; we read in the preface to the 3rd edition of Du Perray's Histoire de cent heros: "But if the voyages of the first (Perray's sage, plausible) should not be more real than those of the other (Homer's Ulysses), at least they will seem more natural, and the events where I make them pass not unlikely seems.... so that with the charm of the marvellous, they will still have the attraction of the truth, incomparably more pleasing than that of fiction."

-7-

Les Avantures d'Amour (1671) and the Aventures (1675) have as an important factor; indeed, as in Gondibalo de Lucon (1737), its unhappy terminus motivates the return voyages.

-8-

This form of fiction does not employ such a frame-work as that of the Decameron. Nor do I think the influence of the Seven Sages is to be considered. More probable is borrowing --were there examples before the translation of the Arabian Nights-- from a translation of the Fables of Pilpay, made in 1644 by David Sahib d'Ispahan-- Livre des Lumières. Still, all the imitations which I have seen or read of are after Galland's Arabian Nights (1704). As for the interest in the Orient, that is evidently earlier. There is Tavernier (1675), for instance, and it is said that the Persian Tales were in a ms. translation by 1678 (cf. 1707). The Turkish Spy is certainly of 1682, and was in Italian, English, French, and German by 1700.

The first fairy-tales (fola-tales?) first (Verlaufer der modernen Novelle, p.38) seen in Perrault's collection of 1696. But, aside from Cupid and Psyche (1669), La

Fontaine's Contes are of the fairy-tale variety at times, and Mme. d'Aulnoy's L'Hypolite (1690) contains a long fairy-tale.

¶4

The imitations of the Arabian Nights tread a downward path, at least in France. The Persian and Turkish Tales require comparison with their sources to determine their attitude. But the Soirées Bretonnes and the Fées Illustres are both free from nastiness. On the other hand, the Transmigrations of the Manitou Dunhoux (17--), the Peruvian Tales (1734), the Contes of Voltaire, etc. are most salacious. The curious reader is referred to Hours 6 and 7 of the Peruvian Tales, and to the close of ch. X, pt. I of Jeanne et Béatarné (1734; Eng.1739); ch. IV, pt.I; ch. I and VIII, pt.III. The Sultan in the Cobra (1741) displays notable wrath at any moral reflections of this piece of furniture.

¶5

Before La Fontaine's Contes he wrote: "It is neither the true nor the vraisemblable which are the beauty and the grace of these things; it is solely the manner" (of relation:). The Contes, however, are in verse. The preface to the Psyche is of a different tone: "Apuleius had Psyche served by voices in a spot where nothing is to be lacking to her pleasures, that is to say, that he makes her taste pleasures without any one's appearing. In the first place, this solitude is wearying, beyond that, it is frightful. Where is the adventurer or the hero who would touch viands which serve themselves? If a lute played of itself, it would make me flee, me who love music extremely.... Accordingly, I have Psyche served by nymphs." Lockman, La Fontaine's English translator of 1744, bursts out thus in a note to p.329 upon the the phrase "la tour lui dit": "With submission to La Fontaine and to Apuleius.... methinks 'tis too forced and unnatural, except we suppose this to be the genius/...of the tower." In the Persian Tales (p.93) the ruler has been listening to Ben-Ridoun relate the enslavement in love of the genius Aboulon by a prince disguised as a woman; he thinks the conquest too easy. Answers Ben-Ridoun: "My Lord, I did not invent this history myself, but had the honor to tell your majesty just as I had read it in

one of our Arabian authors. And, after all, love is an violent a passion and deprives the wisest man of the use of reason" V. also the Chinese Tales (authors' translation, 1834), p. 47; and Oeuvres de Caylus, vol.II (Paris, 1823), pp.

46

[illegible] ch. II, p. .

47

Von Waldberg (p.284) quotes from Grimm a passage to the effect that he had observed a tendency of the fairy-tale to grow into a romance in the hands of Mme. d'Aulnoy and others. This is, of course, a different matter.

48

The chief frame-works are these: in the Turkish Tales the motif of the evil step-mother and the condemned son; in the Soirées [illegible] that of making a princess laugh; in the Chinese Tales that of converting a ruler to Mahometanism ; in the Tartarian Tales that of preserving the life of a physician, his son, and a sultana; in the Peruvian Tales that of preserving an unfortunate Inca from suicide. Of the Soirées [illegible] Pürst writes (Vorläufer des [illegible] Romans, p.84): "Gerstreuung eines edlen Sultans, der in einer eifersüchtigen Laune seine Gemahlin hat töten lassen." The reference to the Soirées is unintelligible to me; nor have I yet succeeded in identifying the collection to which this frame-work does belong.

49

The custom of varying hours, days, nights, quarter-hours, half-hours, etc., varies in different editions of the same collection. The Peruvian Tales, e.g., numbers the hours, but save after hours 1, 12, and 13, the "luminous arm" which transports a Peruvian vestal from her temple to the King does not interfere. Still, I think my statements in the text are sufficiently accurate.

52

The growth of the German short-story has been treated by Henkel in his book of that title. Kurz in Vorlesungen der deutschen Novelle is more desultory. Neither treats expressed theory save very incidentally. We have already quoted from Congreve (p.131) and from Lemoine (p.107). These remarks, however, do not directly apply to the novella in the sense which approximates that of the modern short story. Schlegel before Carell Brooks (1837) insists that the novella be a true relation of fact— no "apostrophes, dialogues, complaints, speeches, conferences, letters, orations." Segrais in Nouvelles françois (1656) gets close to a definition which turns away from the short story; since it is incoherent, I quote Nicolai's Dictionnaire (1664): "the ingenious recital of an agreeable adventure. The matter of nouvelles is the trickery (finesses) and gallant deceit and all that which passes for astonishing and gay (surprenant et gaillard) in the affaires of the world of love. Their end is to be useful and agreeable." Beyond these few statements I have found no material worth quoting before 1750. But there were short stories of a kind quite overlooked by Henkel and Kurz. With very few changes 'Heart du Terrier (1666)— e. g. XXIII— and Letter CII in Court Intrigues (1714) would fit into the pages of a modern magazine. V. further on this Letter XXVV, ch.IX, p. .

"This empire was divided into seven worlds, governed by as many counts, the sans contes pour rire, les contes de la cigogne, les contes jaunes, les contes violets, les contes bleus, les contes à dormir debout, et les contes de veilles, without speaking of several other small contes of less importance.... among all these peoples, the greatest crime was to recount twice the same thing; nor was one introduced there until one left his judgment at the door, with permission to resume it upon his return; but one found it again, almost always, either distracted or corrupted." To this may be added from Crebillon's preface to Tanzai et Néadarné: "There (Genii accessits) are found in their most serious histories, and, whenever any of their heroes is in great danger, a fée exposes him to it, and a conte extricates him." .... Considering these movements in France, is it impossible to conceive that Walpole's Castle of Otranto was begun as a satire? Certainly Mrs. Haywood's Princess of Ijaveo (1736;1741) seems to be such.

The trades of the capital are very interesting, since they represent current fiction. The threaders 'assemble' under the "sign of the 1001 Nights" 'twenty or thirty little nothings." The "flowers" compose under 'Cyrus' 's great work." The 'embroiderers', under the 'Princesse de Cleves" overload a design "with rare and curious materials/" The "botchers" give an "air of novelty to things old and insipid." The 'colourers' give no 'true liveness' but use only 'red and white." The "lanternors" build "towers of brass" and "pillars of diamonds." The"exhibitors of curiosities" describe London or Lisbon. The botchers and colourers I can not identify; perhaps the 'little French histories' are their work. The lanternors are the tellers of non-Oriental fairy-tales. The exhibitors of curiosities are those who follow Prevost, I fancy; the Homme de Qualité travels first in Spain and Portugal, then in England. A criticism of Swift is instructive; a long line of what seem to be ants are observed departing from Arcadia, and we read (I,ii): "How these poor little avortons of human nature were first established in Arcadia, they seemed in the road to prosperity; but doubtless the air of the country did not agree with them.... their patron needed not to have taken so long a voyage to learn what he knew before; that there

is no real greatness in the world.' Cf. the onslaught on Swift in Gulliver's Travels (1726).

/

The translator formula appears, of course. [illegible] "short tale to brag, married they were" (Roberto's Tale, p.[illegible]), and Burton's "to be short" (Gr. Tedesco, p.72) are far enough apart in time to represent the persistance.

2

One reason for the abundance of detail here --indeed, throughout this chapter-- is the tone of Professor Libelius's recently-published Englische Romankunst. Die Technik des Englischen Romans im 18ten Jahrhundert. Of Defoe Libelius writes (Vol.I,p.49): "Aber es zeigen sich bei Defoe auch Ansätze moderner Kunst.... In Interesse der Romantechnik trägt er es fertig, Einzelheiten unter den Tisch fallen zu lassen. Sicher nicht ohne bewusstes künstlerisches Streben; hier und da begegnen Ausdrücke, die es zeigen, wie er die Grenze versteht: 'Doch um ein den Zweifelnden ausführlicher zum Verständnis zu bringen' (Vol.3), 'Doch dieser Dinge und Einzelheiten der Verhandlungen sind zu langweilig, um hier wiederholt zu werden' (Vol.[illegible]). All this is, of course, true. But Libelius seems inclined to regard this as a new matter-- in common with a good many other things that are not new at all in the 18th century. Cf., accordingly, with the quotations from Defoe omissions of substance in Hodge's Essay, 161 (vers); Barclay's Argenis, 333;373 (vers); Mrs. Behn's [illegible] in Works, Vol.[illegible], p. 274 (details of a trial); Severambes, 279 (architectural minuteness); ibid., 371 (religious ceremonies);(details of costumes other than the heroine's at a ball). On character v. Breton's Two Lovers Mirrors (2); Heron's Scythian Letters (2). On setting v. my ch. . In regard to dialogue there was a bitter struggle between the romancers and the realists (v. my ch. V and V in general). The attitude in 1714 is rather well put in a note to Boisguerin's translation of La Fontaine's Loves of Cupid and Psyche; the note (p.) is to an amusing conversation of the lovers, and runs: "How pleasing is all this tittle-tattle! But yet some persons may have the same idea of it, as a Spanish princess had of a delicate conversation between two fond lovers in Cleopatre, 'Of what use are all these fine words, now they are not together.'"

3

V. for situation before 1579 p.XV. Cf. with Lyly's words Riche, Apollonius and

...rile, p.7): "Gentlewoman, I will here for pretty's sake, omit to make repetition of the long and dolorous discourse recorded by Dilis for this sudden departure of her Apollonius, and ...ing you to be as tenderly hearted as Dilia herself, whereby you may the better conjecture the fire of her fever."

4

...ents regarding parts of narratives are very common. V. ...uz de l'Alfarache, p.1bo; ...; ...; Scarron's ...mique, Vol.I, ...; II,...; Don Quixote, Vol.III, 199; ...il Blas, Vol. I, ...; ...; II,53; III,...; ...; ...;

6

Scarron, Furetière, and others have so misrepresented the "longue haleine" romances that they merit a real examination of their attitude (v. briefly. Scarron, e.g., likes to jibe about "meals". In all the Cassandre there are only seven meals (Cotterell's tr., pp.13;[illegible];41;[illegible];161;[illegible]), and only that on 41 is given faintly described. Omission of (a) material already known (cf. Disclius on Lafor. I,p.43 seq.) (b)over detail, (c)captiously irrelevant matter is most common. V. on (a) p.4;41;[illegible]; 81;84;87;[illegible];[illegible];127;[illegible];150;[illegible];[illegible];[illegible];[illegible];[illegible]; on (b) pp.8;30; 31;31;40;[illegible];192;[illegible];[illegible] and 67 other passages; on (c)8;10;[illegible];28;37;[illegible];[illegible];119;127; 131;[illegible];175;185; 191; [illegible]; [illegible];346;316. V., further, Diogène, t.I,liv.I,p.4; Cervantes, t.VI.liv.I,p.162; Clélie, Tome I, p.153.

7

The reader should not forget the five "purposes" of fiction-- to divert, to edify, to instruct, to depict life, to arouse emotion. In considering any one author and his digressions, the author's expressed aim is of prime importance. E.g., Ingelo and Juvenon do not often apologize for digressions-- Ingelo, I think, never in all Bentivolio and Urania, and Juvenon for but three out of twenty digressions in Mr. Badman. On Gay's attitude v. apologies in Rupmes, pp. 152; 213; 247, and in Rupmes and His Bagpipe, pp. 116; 120; [illegible]. At times, one notes, there appears a defense of edifying digressions, which reminds one of Mrs. Ward and Robert Elsmere; v. a passage from Theodora and Didyma's Prances, quoted p. 163. On this Mrs. Manley has (Memoirs of Europe at the Close of the 8th Century, 87): "I beg your Lordship's pardon, declaiming is not altogether so seasonable in a story; I will therefore request permission to return to my little slave." Crébillon's Sultan, who objects to the moral reflections of the Sopha, is also to be considered.

8

V. further p. XXX. Even the early picaresques are found apologizing. Thus Aleman makes his hero say (I,50): "Stop, Guzman, some one will say to me, you are going to lose yourself in your moral reflections." D'Assoucy cuts off from his Aventures d'Assoucy (1677) his Pensées, "because they would interrupt the course of my history."

7

Again 'purpose' must be taken into account. For instance, Lacon writes before a digression upon the name of Solomon's House (New Atlantis, p.190): "...how I shall seem a little to digress; but you will by-and-by find it pertinent." Nashe points out with emphasis his digressory remarks upon Puritanism (Have with You to Saffron Walden, pp.58-60), upon Aretino (93-95), upon Rome (116-117). It is not, it must be understood, contending that Nashe's apologies are serious indications of a desire for unity; they merely show that he knew he was violating a law slowly becoming established. For further digressions see Lawman's Unlucky Citizen, pp. 17;[illegible];100;[illegible]; Theodore and Didymus, pp.2; [illegible]5-140; Pithercastide Apologonie, p.17; the preface to Voyage to the World of Cartesius, etc.

10

On Indian life (70-83); color of negroes (130-131); beauty ([illegible]); life of Oroonoko's life (124); tattooing (147); life in Surinam (152-171); one of Mrs. Behn's comedies (135).

11

Neither the theory of the Petites Romans nor that of the Nouvelle Astrée should be taken out of relation to the book presented. Cf., the Nouvelle Astrée hostilely objects to any retrenchment of the "romanisms" of L'Orfé, agreeing in this with the preface of Les Aventures de .... (1714), which runs: "I do not find it to my taste that there has been excision (or a retrenché) from romans of all which could render them useful and often even interesting. Those composed at present are only simple adventures recounted with a taste which in truth amuses the reader, but which neither affects nor touches him....(my) fiction is sowed with reflections." On informational digressions the preface to the second edition(1730) of Ramsay's Travels of Cyrus is illuminating; Ramsay had in 1727 declared emphatically that his romance was a mere thread upon which to hang history, geography, etc., but in 1730 he recants, stating that he tries to make this matter a natural outgrowth of the story.

12

Cf. Jacob Milton (p.17): "Let me be a historiographer of my own misfortunes, and not meddle with the continual trophies of my all-triumphing City." Memoirs of an English Officer (180): "And as I have not often committed such a transgression, I hope it [description of religious houses of Valencia] may be the more excusable now, and no way blemish my memoirs." Memoirs of Europe at the close of the XVII century (83): "I hope some particulars [of ox-hunting in Poland], because it agrees with the business of my narrative, will not be displeasing."

14

Cf. further on nikola, Vol.I, pp.[illegible];268;270; II,1;166; III,[illegible]; IV,1;79. The wretchedly-written Agony-book of 1684 has in its preface: "But of necessity we must barely apply our descriptions to the nature of the whole history." And v. Rust's view in his Traité (quoted p. [illegible]), and that of Bougeant (quoted p. [illegible]).

[illegible]. previous to Amadis, Amadis of Gr. I, p.

15

I give a partial list: fibs and praises of women (Ricle; Lyly; Greene), a rhapsody on nitrates (The Choice and Delights, [illegible]); gaffs of the English home (Unlucky Citizen, 136), a dissertation on how to compose (Ibid., [illegible]); ridicule of a précieuse (Comte Gabalis, [illegible]); a treatise on plants (Argenis, 166-170; The Love of Country (Lucian, 208-212); account of the school for eunuchs (Ibid., 447); theories of poetry (Love Letters, Vol.I, [illegible]), bits at Greek (Memoirs of Europe, 12-13).

16

Cf. for apologies Andreas Chaplanus, pp. 11;14;66;68. Defender and anti-Amadis (1755

tr.), pp.33; [illegible] loco. cons. Cooper, Sp.-, p.4; [illegible]; [illegible]; [illegible]; 233;236, 241. Sowerby, in Dec., works clever out of his twelve digressions of this type.

17

loc.cit., p.8; cf. p.41. Miss Morgan (p.36) quotes several other passages, but errs in saying that "Lodowyck is the first who employed it so largely and so consciously." The Fleurs du Parnasse (1582) has a marvellous digression on why Philonte does not know the time of night (7-8). La Roustiau calmly ignores a 30-page digression on laughter and pity, inserted into his Gyrald and Tycho: "My principal aim is always to please; to arrive at it I consider the task of the century.... That is why I have introduced their dialogue touching pity and laughter." Kirkman writes (Unlucky Citizen, 1673): 'for I confine myself to no order in my writing, but as I think convenient, so manage my story: but still keeping to the thread of it: know I have left it [illegible] present, and shall do so for a while' (p.261; cf.21;209;291).

18

This type is not always told in the first person. It may be narrated by a friend, lover, or servant.

19

It is a mistake to connect verse between 1579 and 1670 or thereabout with the pastoral romance to the exclusion of other forms. Undoubtedly the pastorals (with the exception of Arcadian de Versac (1615)) contain more verse; but a tabulation of some occurrences of this ornament will show its prevalence before 1670. Verse appears in Whetstone's Promos and Cassia 6 times; in Lodge's Margarite of America 10 in his Heart the Devil 7; in Greene's Mamillia 9; in Nash's Jack Wilton 4; in Lyly's Euphues 12; in Lodge's Rosalynde 13; in the Spanish Tragedy 23; in Montemayor and Urania 7; in Lodge's Rosalynde 11; in Sidney's Arcadia 5, in his Poems of Reading 4, and in his Apology Draft 25. In the next column are 1250 lines all told. After 1670 I shall do verse in the better pleasure verse. However, in Les Exilés (1677) occur 8 pieces of "poetry;" in the Second Volume to Ptolia (1725) 4; in Agnes de

Castro (1677); in the [illegible]; in Salinas; in [illegible] (1701)[illegible]
14. Some of this later verse, it must be remembered, is [illegible] in composition-- e.g., the one piece of verse in the Desengaños, a Chapter vaguely inconsistent, is a [illegible] to the unity.

20 Cf. also the preface to Camilo's Semanario erudito: "The other pieces, which fill up the intervals of the story (of a heroico-historical romance), and grace it with pleasing varieties, are commonly frivolous carnival of wit in [illegible] matter, and serve but to some such slight purpose, as drop the writing of verses in the form of an egg or [illegible] interest.... Those are fine realities or no use, the inconsistence of them by accidence being as trifles to the principal design."

21 Cf. p. ex. de Salignac, before mentioned, writes (I, 4): "But the novels and the other pieces more extended are not allegorical....They are there in more for diversion than through necessity" (p. 172).

22 Even [illegible] (p.): "seeing what the poor shepherds did may not be a tedious digression."

23 [illegible] Cervantes's [illegible] is a [illegible]. The translator Jarvis is [illegible] to say (rt. III, 30): "One of the faults that they say is in that history, is this: that his author put in it a certain novel or tale, entitled the Curious Impertinent, not that it was ill., or not well contrived, but that it was unseasonable for that place, neither had it anything to do with the history of Don Quixote." Cf. also p. [illegible].

24 After the attack upon Cervantes most authors abandoned the "inserted novel."

[illegible] and Jurieu, it is true, remain defiant. One-third of the [illegible] is taken up by six novels, only two of which (vol.1, p.285-411; vol.3, 1-67 and 7-37) are specialized for; and the Roman bourgeois contains the [illegible] of Lupin (pt. 1, 208-18) and the inventory of Mythophilactes's library (pt.1, 72 seq.). Even Alexandre the Great was cited wearingly a "deity of custom for his [illegible] (p. 136).

25

"Ah! for what reason does it please you to write so diligently the history of another, while you have been so slow in continuing your own? Must it not be that the religieuse has herself written her history, that she has left it to you, and that you copy it?"

26

In Histoire v. p. 7. Desmarets writes later (1670): "If the histories that you tell have no interesting ons with another one if they are not joined and tangled with the principal history which is to reign, thus serving as members to the body, it will be said that you have no art."

27

The nature of the realistic novel is well illustrated in Sorel's Feinings of the novel, p.17. "Cardan Criquebeuf's principal [illegible] has only a vague and wavering plot. Action scarce exists in it. The scandalous chronicles of the time tell us that the lady was painting her own love affair with[illegible] Rochefoucauld. And since the real event was but a scattered, ineffective, and futile performance, what can we possibly expect of its paper shadow?" One not dissimilar critique does Sorel's work seem to me to be the death of [illegible] prose fiction in the 17th century.

28

"Although I would have been able to insert in my memoirs (of the Roman de mal-

ille) the adventures of Doppler Jr. (Henry Conway), it does seem to me that, since they had no necessary connection, the reader would find any satisfaction in seeing them separately. [illegible] recitation of this latter would have but [illegible] interrupted the thread of my own history."

29

[illegible], Vol. I, p. [illegible]. The title of [illegible]'s story of the expedition of Claude [illegible], and (b) Tillott's own troop (p. 70). [illegible] are his own narratives.

30

"My history of this is thus put in the mouths of [illegible]..." (Vol. II, p. 5): "And I am not certain from recollection that some narratives, in which, in truth, I had very little part, but which I believe I was still [illegible] the design which I proposed in writing these [illegible] of my life, is still continued [illegible] by [illegible]." Cf. Hawkins's Preface to ..., p. [illegible].

31.

[illegible] of self-like reveals in a return to the theme or sequence of the earliest period of a novel is [illegible] to be seen in the close of Irene Allison and in that of Irving's [illegible]. Secondly, I reject such an interpretation of the authors' words. In the [illegible] of unity of "theme" I find it true in [illegible] theory.

I recognize, of course, the recent attacks of Brander Matthews and others upon Freytag's pyramidal representations of the structure of drama-- in especial, of tragedy. Yet, despite these, it is possible to "diagram" even modern dramas in a form resembling that suggested by Freytag as basal. To force such diagrams upon Tom Jones, Vanity Fair, The Ordeal of Richard Feverel, Dorian Gray, etc., is to shut one's eyes to facts. The structure of a novel seems to me to depend upon the author's professed aim, upon the type of fiction to which it belongs, and upon its line of interest. This line need not rise consistently, by any means.

2

Two objections may be urged against my statement that the effect of sequels is destructive of dramatic structure in fiction-- namely, that in the 17th century "sequels" were often terms to denote parts which were published at intervals, and that authors who never intended to produce sequels were forced to do so, because of illegitimate continuations by unscrupulous contemporaries. Neither of these arguments affects my point. In the first place, I have cited such works as employed "sequels" in the modern sense of the word; in the second place, the wails against "continuers" are mainly untrustworthy and from those realists who were professed enemies of unity. At intervals we have noted the attitudes of the leaders of the wailing-- Cervantes, Aleman, Head. I must own I am not at all inclined to trust even Bunyan, when he gives as his reason for the second part of Pilgrim's Progress:

"'Tis true, some have of late, to counterfeit
My Pilgrim, to their own my title set;
Yea others, half my name and title too
Have stitched to their book, to make them do."

3

One curious result of the theory of sequels, and one which would be most disastrous in drama, is the appearance in a continuation of references, which are unintelligible save to readers of the earlier work. Thus in Pilgrim's Progress, pt. II, we find ten such references to pt. I; v. pp. [illegible];252;258;259;283;310;328;337;348. In

particular, Bunyan writes on [illegible]: "which house was built for the relief of pilgrims; as you will find more fully related in the first part."

4 Tale of a Tub, p. [illegible]. I have found only one other remark about sequels before 1740, this in the preface to Gay's opera of Polly (1727): "a sequel to a play is like more last words. 'Tis a kind of absurdity.... the pleasure of novelty is lost; and I am afraid I shall hardly be pardoned for imitating myself." It is worth noting that Polly can stand alone, and has a structure in no way related to that of the Beggar's Opera.

I am not defending sequels. I call attention to them partly because they are a portion of pre- Richardsonian expressed theory, and partly because their presence raises in me a doubt of the truth of the present theory of the structure of a novel. As I have said , there has been an attempt to force both students and authors to view the novel as having definite laws of structure closely related to those of the drama; even Mr. Bliss Perry, who is in general admirably unprejudiced, seems to me to go too far in his chapter upon Fiction and the Drama (The Study of Prose Fiction). One point certainly needs to be determined. Was it a novelist or a mere critic who raised the question? I do not know. But it makes a great deal of difference whether the idea was or was not a natural development in the so-called "evolution" of fiction.

6 W/ ch. VI, pp. 110-112.

7 At this point Amilcar admits that the autobiographical method is good practice, "in order to see whether one would have enough art to do it well."

8

Montesquieu (preface to Lettres Persanes) presents the case for the first person: "There is another reason why these romances succeed, and that is, because the persons introduced give themselves an account of what happens to them, which causes the passions to be felt more sensibly than any narration made by another would do." Here, also, it is well to remember the aid the lovers of print in fiction derived from first-person s. and memoirs.

9

Implications for theories of characterization are treated in Ch. II.

10

V. ch. X, pp. .

11

I have purposely stated this dilemma so that what seems to me its absurdity is evident. Nor will one find it in the pages of such a sane work as Bliss Perry's Study of Prose Fiction. However, more and more there has been a tendency to emphasize in the autobiography the need to stick to the facts that the writer of his experience would easily know, and in the third-person narrative to assume the point of view of as few personages as possible. Cf., e.g., the rather ambiguous language of Horne's Technique of the Novel, pp. 140-142-- the close of all his words being: "These masters, however, (Dickens, Thackeray, Hugo, Dumas) worked in what was still a formative period; the technique of the novel was not yet fully understood." Considering that many critics are far more insistent than Horne upon these points-- does it not mean that a note of distinct revolt is necessary? Omniscience does not trouble even the critical reader of novels-- unless he be trained to detect flaws (if they are flaws) in consistency, and then-- even Mr. Howells and Mr. James will not escape. We accept in the theatre a manifest absurdity-- a three-walled room. Why not accept in the novel an ommiscient author, provided he does not confuse our ordinary senses?

12 Jacques Tilton, p. 157. Parmeline's manner has been described by Sorel, who then bethinks himself that he has been in an upper room, and adds: "While I through a crany of my upper chamber unsealed, had beheld all this sad spectacle."

13 The preface to the Astrée is in point. But the first direct bow to the principle of point of view is, I think, in Domingo Gonsales' Voyage to the Moon (pub. 1638): "Among others (the English) they took up our captain, who as rather oracle since told me...." V. also the opening pages to the Severambians, Jacques Sadeur, Marianne, etc.

14 Cassandre (Rotterell's tr.), p.29. Cf. pp.47;75. V. also Mémoires de la Vie du Comte D.... (1695), Vol. I, p.251: "Before continuing the recital of my adventures, I believe I ought to relate that passed at Madrid after my departure. I was informed of this detail only long afterward; but here is the natural place to speak of it."

15 Roman Bourgeois, Vol. I, p.37. Cf. Lisbie Poiteux, p.75. An interesting point is that the realists are themselves open to attack. The marquis of the Roman Bourgeois, e.g., has no confidant. Yet, p. 93) we read of his secret visit to Lucrece's cabinet in order to steal his contract of marriage with her. Furetière writes calmly: "This is how the thing happened."

16 Princes Jean-Feredin, p.116. Longuent ironically explains the mystery by revealing the fact that there are four stereotyped conversations in Arcadia, all engraved on tablets at the entrance of the forest of Love (p.111) four because "they have not yet been able to invent a fifth." He also refers to the habit of heroes and heroines of lamenting aloud.

V. p. LVII for the theories upon the proper openings for epics; and the whole of ch. III, showing the advance of the preface to the dignity of a first chapter.

Such works as de Vieu's Baron Lourcaste (1617), Baptiste's Acacie (1621), and Luynes's Sr. Ladman (1654) are wholly in dialogue. Sgr. Adam's Lisy of Santum begins with conversation.

It should not be supposed that there were no exceptions. The Histoire Celtique dilates upon the glory of Gaul before the reader is allowed to meet Norasisse hailing her prisoner Catugene to the mines; Lybanée presents a scene of unparalleled gorgeousness, as a shell-boat conveys the Orontes; the poesie devotes four pages to the history of the period of Valentinian and Lupor, before Doras sees lords cut the Princess to death.

Huet censures Heliodorus for not beginning in the middle of events, and Longlet insists that only by "episodes" are we to learn the earlier life of a hero or heroine.

This mode of meeting seems to be an inheritance from the Greek romance. The first instance of the use of a temple-- usually that of Venus-- is in Antlia and Leucippe or Clitophon and Leucippe, whichever one prefers to put earlier. The Fiammetta of Boccaccio follows this device. So, too, does Polisenne de Crosme (1538) first perceive her bourgeois lover at church, Astrée glances at Celadon within the temple of Venus, Artamène perceives Mandane at a sacrificial ceremony, Mariamne catch the eye of Valville during mass, etc. The importance of cathedrals in Spanish fiction is great. It is to be observed that these meetings are not always in the first pages. Thus the Astrée opens on the bank of the Lignon; the temple-scene occurs in a reverting portion of the romance.

21 How uneasy Sorel's ethics made authors who wrote even twenty years afterward may, I think, be seen in the preface to Pt. I of Ibrahim. That heroine does not appear for many pages, and Calprenède warns the reader that he must not fancy her a minor character. This the reader understands only when he comes to identify Ibrahim with Statira, an often-mentioned princess. It is true that Calprenède may merely be attempting to mystify the reader. I doubt it.

22 The realists themselves opened their works in medias res. Sorel begins, after a discursive opening on comedy, with the trick upon the aged Alcantor which sends Francion forth into the world. The Roman Comique hurries the reader into the presence of an operatic troupe approaching Mans. The Roman Bourgeois presents a bourgeois wooing at the church of St. Catherine.

23 This is apparently an imitation of the opening of Lysander and Calista (1617).

24 Sorel expresses my own feeling when I first opened Cervantes's Aegisunds and Persiles! It should be noted that Sorel's words do not apply, even by anticipation, to the best-known 17th century romances. These aim in the first lines to state a startling event, orientating the reader as to time, place, and characters. On the other hand, I have observed, outside of Cervantes's unfortunate romance, such beginnings as these: "After Polyxene had learned of the death of her dear Clyarte, she resolved to die" (Calprenède's Cléopâtre, 1647); "The beautiful Calisanda had no sooner learned the victory that the triumphant Corinthe" (Scudéry's Histoire Asiatique, 1652); "Already the doors of the town of Bruges, that the King of Castile had besieged for three weeks" (Juvenal's Les Galeries, 1645). It is amusing that the storiettes of certain American magazines tend more and more to these interest-exciting openings.

Cf. the views of the other satirists. Scarron writes (Roman Comique, Vol. II, p. 56): "The beginning of this history, quoth the prior, can not but be a little tedious, since it consists chiefly of genealogy. Nevertheless, this sort of beginning is necessary to introduce a perfect understanding of the matter in dispute." Furetière (Roman Bourgeois, p. 26) has: "I do not at all wish, moreover, to make poetic fictions, nor to begin at the wrong end, that is to say, to commence my history with the end, as do all those messieurs who believe they have introduced such refinements in finding the marvellous and surprising, when they make of this kind the narrative of some adventure." Sorel himself has further criticisms upon the Arcadia (v. p. 72) and on the Argenis. The Argenis opens thus: "The Universe had not yet adored Rome, nor the Ocean given place to Tiber, when, upon the coast of Sicily, where the river Gelas enters the sea, there arrived in the port a strange ship, out of which came ashore a young knight, transcendently handsome." Sorel comments: "Who sees not but this observation is too general for so particular a circumstance? And the question been about the conquest of one of the four parts of the world, or that an universal change of religion and customs had happened over the whole earth, it haply would not have been unhandsome to note the time so particularly; but since it only concerns the time of a ship's arrival in Sicily, it had been enough to have said what it was of the clock, whether it was night or day, summer or winter; or what could have been most presumed, it might have been permitted to relate the condition the affairs of the Island were in at that time. To be short, no man will deny me, but that if the author had said that Meleander reigned at that time in Sicily, and that Lycogenes, who had taken up arms against him, was upon the point of concluding a peace when such a vessel arrived into the haven, it had spoken more judgment."

Cf. the opening of the Amadis, ed. 1540: "A little time after the passion of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, there was a King of Little Brittany named Garinter, wise in the law of truth, and highly adorned with good and laudable virtues, who had, by a noble lady, his wife, two daughters." Ramifications of genealogy follow.

[17] Von Tscharner (p. 67) speaks of this work as though it began abruptly. An opening of a type midway between the *in medias res* and the genealogical is that of the Roman de Cassis (1670): "After the conquest of Italy, Charles VIII, king of France, returning into his kingdom, found the queen at Amboise, with the Duke and Duchess of Alençon and Mlle/ d'Alençon, their daughter, whose wit and beauty had greatly increased since the departure of the king." Very modern is the humorous scene in a cardroom with which the Comte de Warwick (1704) opens.

[18] Of course this is exaggeration. Yet cf. the opening of the Cytherée (1642): "The sun was only a little farther from the Indies than from the Atlantic Ocean, and his light was almost equally spread over all the hemispheres, when upon the tranquil face of the Syrian Sea, appeared a marvel which had never been seen save on that memorable day when Venus, still damp from the maternal waves, came to shore upon the coasts of Cyprus. Far from the mouth of the famous river Orontes floated almost motionless a great shell, which shone in the rays of the sun as if it had been of gold." For 31/4 pages this is kept up.

[19] Specific writers, who produced many works, often had favorite openings. Thus the strange works of Penelope Aubin (v. p. LXXXV) open with historical references.

[20] All works of fiction are for the moment including in this division.

[21] Cf. the words of Mlle/. de Lussan (v. p. LXVIII). In La Jeune Clélie (1677), p. 166, we read: "Is it not to be finished by marriage? returned Cotall, that would be against the rules of romance." The Abbé Pérrault insists (Vol. I, p. 18) that a book should terminate in one or more marriages, and that a hero may not marry at the beginning or in the midst of a story; to go beyond mar-

ridge "is to weave two great actions in a single plot -- crime capital." As for the group marriage, it is not so constant as is supposed; the Artamène, e.g., ends with five marriages in five days. At least few 17th century writers have it weddings in one day, as is the case in the Polexia or Argent (Fol. 17, 181--97). In the series of two-line paragraphs with which the peyer-less novels of te-- ry end a survival of this:

32
Professor Raleigh considers this satirical.. I am not sure. Also, Mr Gordery's Aimable was left with much the same remark. V. also Cronces and Cyrenia (p. 7, 1664 tr.)

33
V. Lysis to Clarimonde (p. 264): "There will be one thing very remarkable in my history.... and that is, that all who shall read it will be finely deceived; they will imagine to find at least a marriage between the shepherd Lysis and the shepherdess Charite according to the ordinary rules of all romances, but there will be no such thing."

34
V. p. 5 for Underdown's preface to the Pompeyus and Charicles.

35
Some of the chronique scandaleuses end with the destruction of an entire wicked race, e.g., Memoirs of an Island Adjacent to Utopia.

36
V. Lysias in regard to these imitations. e.g. I touches upon them.

37
V. also preface to the Comte d'Amboise, as quoted in Aldberg, p. .

[illegible] Comte de Tyrica, 1734. The heroine is even more faultless than the Princesse de Cleves. [illegible] to find unity.

[illegible] In practice the novella-collections of Cervantes, Queiroz, Prado, etc., depart widely from the disregard of poetic justice, so in Cervantes in Boccaccio and Margaret of Navarre. The young [illegible] often ends unhappily, as far as the love element is concerned.

[illegible] There follows a section on how to dress after marriage, on the care of the heroine's five children, etc.

[illegible] The slight attacks upon probability about 1730-1750 are not to be forgotten. V. pp.

[illegible] In especial the semi-chivalric romances retain the out-and-out formulae discussed in ch. I. [illegible] the formula, which explicates the "you will recall" formula, pp. 5;[illegible];[illegible];61;66;[illegible];[illegible]; Prado's Two Novels Pirated, with 10 "let us returns" in 27 pages; [illegible], [illegible] transition carefully noted, pp.15;[illegible];4;52;63;66;75; 83;123;[illegible]. Hedge, indeed, is [illegible] material; cf. Fortunius and Griseria,57;62; Heart the Evil, [illegible]; Values' Answer,[illegible]; Margarite of Amorica, [illegible]. For [illegible] the types of transition are many; the formulae are found [illegible] Col. 1,[illegible]; [illegible]; 111,[illegible];181;[illegible]; [illegible]; 1,[illegible];61;66;75; [illegible]. [illegible], however, like Prado, Queiroz, [illegible], Prado, transition by the number of time leaps other methods; thus in Cervantes' Novels 7 out of 25 transitions (pp. [illegible]) are by time, and the percentage is only a trifle less in Zamora and Contreras; in Count of Lemos and no formal transitions and in the Gentle Craft but two (pt.II,[illegible];60); in Castelion 6 out of 21

transitions are formal, only one by time; in Aubin d'Ivorche are but 2 formal transitions, these all in the "inserted" chivalric tale of Owain and Lyons (7a;1-; 10?); in the parody out of 65 transitions but one is formal, 44 are by time, and 19 by "but." Other tabulations which I have made have not these extremes.

43

Tabulation shows this. Formal transitions are likely, in the first place, to be variously worded; v., e.g., Madion and Euphigenia (1665), p. 17: "These three noble consorts having travelled for many few days together, came at length to a certain way, which might properly be so called, for it was the means of parting Ithoun from the other two, whom we shall also part from for a time, and, leaving him, associate ourselves to Madion and Erimander." For other formal transitions v. ibid., p.10;40; 134;137;144;166;187;214; Lower Lorraine, Vol. 1, 27;43;181; 200;233;272; 11,41; Inconsolata,4b;51; Bil Blas, 271;285; Peruvian Tales, 224. The Lentivolio and Drusia, the Palemique, and Theodore and Hidymus have no such transitions. In Inchbald Mrs. Behn and Penelope Aubin represent the two main tendencies at the close of our period. In all Mrs. Behn's eight novels occurs but one formal transition-- this used to point an obscene jest (King of Bantam,p.121); in Oroonoko 7 out of 14 transitions are by time, in the Fair Jilt 5 out of 8, in the Nun 4 out of 7, in Agnes de Castro 9 out of 22, in the Lucky Mistake 3 out of 15, in the King of Bantam 1 out of 6, and in the Lucky Mistake 2 out of 2. On the other hand, the formal transition appears in all Mrs. Aubin's six novels, but restricted to the close of chapters; v. the Noble Slaves, p. 44;54;101;116;144;151;176;182.

future investigators.

Biard, Arthur. Christiande de Saule. 1661, Paris.

Boccaccio Giovanni. De Philosophie des Dames (Le Decameron). 1343. Paris, 1...

Breton Nicholas. Strange Fortunes of Two Excellent Young Princes. 1600. London, 1879 (Works of Breton, ed. by Grosart.)

Cervantes Miguel. Los Trabajos de Persiles y Sigismunda, Historia Septentrional. Madrid, 1617.

Cord Emmanuel. The Most Famous, Celestial, and Renowned History of Cristus. 1653. London, 1661.

Cord Emmanuel. The Most Levant History of Erastus and Artesia. 1660. London, 1661.

Cord Emmanuel. The Famous History of Contention. 1675. London, 1700.

Desmarets de St. Sorlin. Ariane. Paris, 1632 (only two vol. pub.) Paris, 1637, (five vol.)

Desmarets de St. Sorlin. Les Mythéores. Paris, 1653. Paris, 1654 (Paris 1637).

Desmarets de St. Sorlin. La Comédie Celidée. Paris, 1632 (Paris 1632).

Ercole Servidori di Parma. Peregrino. 1538.

Estienne Pasquier. Recherches de la France. 1581. London, 1879 (Oeuvres, Tome II.— Works of Pasquier, vol.).

Estienne Pasquier. History of Ancient Customs Laws of Normandy. 1858. London, 1879. (Oeuvres, Tome II.— Works of Pasquier, vol.).

Estienne Pasquier. A Marguerite of Queries. 1586. London, 1879. (Oeuvres, Tome II.— Works of Pasquier, vol.).

Montalvo Garci-Ordonez de. Amadis de Gaul. 1470? Paris, 1540, tr. by Herberay, Nicolas de.

Mortoreil, Fronte el Blanco. 1611. London, 1727, tr. by Capius, Conte de.

Parus Francesco. Palmerin of England. 1582(1587). London, 1807, reduction by Southey of A. Munday's tr. of 1637.

Perel Charles. L'Orphise de Chrysante. Paris, 1626.

du Perdier Gilbert J. Roman des Romans. Paris, 1626.

Chansiergues. [illegible]. [illegible]. [illegible].

Fénelon. Télémaque. Paris, 1699.

Lyly John. Euphues. 1579. Heilbronn, 1887, ed. by Landmann, .

Lyly John. Euphues and His England. 1581. Oxford, 1868 (Works, vol. II, ed. by Bond,

Massey Andrew Michael. Travels of Cyrus. Edinburgh, 1737.

Terrasson, Abbé de. Sethos. 1731.

Nova Solyma. Hierosolymitanae Urbis Laudes. 1648. London, 1902, ed. by Begley, .

Barrin Jean. Strotonic. 16[illegible]. Paris, 1641.

Barker Jane. Exilius. 17[illegible]. London, 1719.

Baron . Cyprian Academy. London, 1648.

Beaudoin Jean. Histoire Lacedemonique. Paris, 1661.

Beaudoin Jean. Lindamire. Paris, 16[illegible].

Bolingbroke. Orenoko. 1688. London, 1873 (Lloyd, Victories, and Novels of the Seventeenth Century, ed. by John, vol.).

Boyse Robert. Parthenissa. London, 1654.

Buchholtz J. C. Der Christlichen Teutschen Grossfürsten Herculis und der Römischen Königlichen Fräulein Valisca Lebensgeschichte. 1[illegible]-1[illegible].

Buchholtz J. C. Herculiscus und Herculadisia. 1[illegible].

Calprenède Gautier de Costes Sieur de la. Cassandre. 1642-1645. London, 1676, tr. by Cotterell .

Calprenède Gautier de Costes Sieur de la. Cléopatre. 1646-1654. Paris, 1667.

Calprenède Gautier de Costes Sieur de la. Pharamond. 1661-1667. (Continued by Vaumoriere, 1667-1670). Paris, 1674.

Chevreau Urbain. Scanderberg. Paris, 1644.

Chevreau Urbain. L'Heroïcisme. Paris, 1648.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Defoe, Daniel. [illegible]. London, 17[illegible].

Defoe, Daniel. Life of Jonathan Wild. London, 17[illegible].

Defoe, Daniel. Account of Christian Bill. London, 17[illegible].

Defoe, Daniel. Account of Duncan Law. London, 17[illegible].

Espinel, Vicente. Relaciones de la vida del escudero Marcos de Obregon. [illegible]. London, 17[illegible]. tr. of [illegible] Langton.

Fontaines, Abbé de. [illegible] Paris, 17[illegible].

Grimmelshausen, Johann Jacob Christoffel von. [illegible]. Stuttgart, [illegible].

Head, Richard and Kirkman, Francis. The English Rogue. [illegible].

Head, Richard. Hickson's Temptation. London, 1671.

Kirkman, Francis. The Unlucky Citizen. London, 1673.

Lesage, Alain-René. Le Diable boiteux. Paris, 1707.

Lesage, Alain-René. Histoire de Gil Blas. 1715-1735. Paris, 1821 (Oeuvres Choisis).

Lesage, Alain-René. Le Chevalier du Beauchêne. 1732. Paris, 1821 (Oeuvres Choisis).

Lesage, Alain-René. Le Bachelier de Salamanque. [illegible]. Paris, 1820 (Oeuvres Choisis).

Lesage, Alain-René. Nouvelles et Poésies. 1734 (in part taken from Spanish original of 1641). Paris, 1821 (Oeuvres Choisis).

Lodge, Thomas. Life and Death of William Longbeard. 1593. London, 1847 (Hunterian Club Pub., vol.).

Lodge, Thomas. Wounds of Civil War. 1594. London, 1815, reprint of tr. by Marlowe, Kyd and Nashe (1592).

Lucha, Thomas. The Unfortunate Traveller [second edition]. 1594. London, 1817 [illegible] of Jessie, ed. by Henry Morley,

Mateo Aleman de. Guzman de Alfarache. 1599. London, 1622, tr. by J. Mabbe.

Quevedo Francisco Gomez de. La Vida del Gran Tacano. 1631. London, 17[illegible], tr. by Mr. Vincent.

Salas Barbadillo de. The Courtier's Scout. [illegible] London, 1679, tr. by Tyrer, J.

Scuter T. Wheleoffsky. 1665.

Sorel, Charles. Histoire Comique de Francion. 1623. Paris, 1858, ed. by Colombey, Adolphe.

X ...ligny. ... aventures ... to ... 1617. ..., 1729.

X ... ... vol. ... 1716. ..., 1713.

X ... ... 1666. ..., 1716.

X ... ... 1677. ..., ..., ed. by ..., Adolphe.

X ... ... 1697. ... in ..., vol. ...VI.

X ... ... 1633. ..., 1633 (... ...), ..., ..., vol. i).

X ... ... 1637. ... of ..., t. i; 1677, t. ii, in ..., Vol. ...ii).

... ... 1681. ..., 1682, tr. ... ... Paris.

X ... ... 1866 (1867). ..., 1864, ed. by ....

X ... ... 1861-1862. ..., 1881, ... ed. by ..., Vol. ii).

X ... ..., 1867 (...), t. i; ..., vol. ...ii).

X ... ..., 1867 (...), t. i; ..., vol. ...ii).

X ... ..., 1861 (...), ed. by ..., vol. i).

... ... 1666. ...

X ... ... 1868. ..., 1874, tr. by Vance ....

... ... 1707. ..., 1811 (... ...).

... ..., ... 1716. ..., 17..-17..

X ... ... 1862. ...

X Petronius. Satyricon. cir. 54-68. Cambridge, 1906, tr. by ...owe W. D.

sterdam, 75..

Prévost d'Exiles François. Histoire de M. Cleveland. 1731-1732. London [& Fr.], 1777.

Prévost d'Exiles François. Le Doyen de Killerine. 1735-1740. Paris, [& Paris], [n.d. 1741].

Scudéry Courtilz de. La Vie de Jacques de Bridieu. Paris, 1686.

Scudéry Courtilz de. Mémoires de Monsieur [illegible]. 1687. Bologne, [n.d.].

Scudéry Courtilz de. Testament politique de Colbert. La Haye, 1693.

Scudéry Courtilz de. Mémoires de d'Artagnan. Amsterdam, 1700.

Scudéry Courtilz de. Mémoires de M. le Marquis de Montbrun. Amsterdam, 1701.

Saint-Réal. Don Carlos. Amsterdam, 1672 (1671).

Sévigné Mme. de. Mémoires de la Comte de Bourgogne. 1726. London, 1751.

Sorbière de Tillemary. Paris, 1653.

Spanheim, Prince de Orbe. Paris, 1678.

Tudor, Prince of Wales. London, 1678.

d'Audiguier Pierre. Ismaire et Lalliste. 1618. London, 1630, tr. by [illegible].

Boccaccio Giovanni. Fiammetta. 1343. Milan, 1879 (Milano pere).

Crébillon Fils, de Fils. Les Egarements du Coeur (Fr. de Meilcoeur). 1736. Paris, 1765.

Crenne Héliseno de. Les Angoysseux Infortunes qui procèdent d'Amours. Lyons, 1538.

Flores Juan de. Breve Tractado de Grimalte y Gradissa. After 1487. Paris. 1528, as La Déplorable Fin de Fiammetta.

Flores Juan de. Le Jugement d'Amour. 1491. Paris, 1500.

Marini Giovanni Francois. Le Calomnie Fidèle. 1681. Paris, 1760, tr. by Joyeus, Comte de.

La Fayette Marie Madeleine de. La Princesse de Cleves. 1678. (Paris, 1678 (Romans et Nouvelles de Mme. de La Fayette.

Marivaux Pierre Carlet de Chamblain de. [illegible] ou les effets surprenans de la sympathie. Paris, 171[illegible].

Marivaux Pierre Carlet de Chamblain de. [illegible] Paris, [illegible]. 1731-1734 (Imprint, 1735).

Marschal [illegible]. La Chevalite. 1[illegible]7. Paris, 1[illegible]4.

Prévost d'Exiles Antoine François. Histoire de quelques Ecossais (pub. 1728 as the first volume of Mémoires d'un Homme de qualité). Paris, 1877.

Rojas Fernando de. Celestina. 1499. London, 1[illegible]01, tr. by J. Mabbe.

San Pedro Diego de. Prison d'Amour. 1[illegible]81. Lyons, 1[illegible]85, tr. by Bertrand, ... L'Histoire des Prognes Cours d'Egypte et d'Isabelle, Captivité. [illegible]111, 1[illegible]87.

San Pedro Diego de. Carcel d'Amor. 1492. Paris, [illegible]16, as Prison d'Amour.

Schnabel Philipp von. Die Wunderliche Gesandte. Nuremberg, 1[illegible]10. (reprint in Deutsche Litteratur Leben und Lieben Jahrhunderts., pp. 187-1[illegible]).

Staël [illegible]. [illegible] Paris, 1[illegible]6.

LATER FICTIONS

Abelard and Heloise. Love-letters. cir. 1123. London, 1[illegible]04.

Alcoforado Mariana. Love-letters of a Portuguese Nun. 1[illegible]6[illegible]. London, 1903, tr. by Prestage, E.

d'Aubignac Abbé (Hédélin). Le Roman des Lettres. Paris, 1[illegible]67.

Crébillon Prosper, le Fils. Lettres de la Marquise de [illegible] au Comte de [illegible]. Paris, 17[illegible].

Heywood Eliza. Letters of Clarissa. 1713? London, 171[illegible].

Manley Mary. Letters in Imitation of Those of a Portuguese Nun. London, 1[illegible]96.

Manley Mary. Court Intrigues in a Collection of Original Letters from the Island of the Mer Atalentis. London, 1711.

Montesquieu C. de Secondat, Baron de. Lettres Persanes. 1721. [illegible]or London, 1767 (Works, vol. III)

Pendarves Mary. [illegible] Familiar Letters. London, 1[illegible]5.

Pierre and Vivia. London, 17[illegible].

Sept Lettres Amoureuses d'une Dame à un Chevalier. Paris, 167[illegible]. (Lemault)

ettres [illegible]. [illegible], 7[illegible].

[illegible]-letters [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible], 1[illegible]. [illegible], 1784.

([illegible] these are the same; I have not seen the 1817 ed).

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Le Premier Acte du Grand Couronnement des Grilles, Grenouilles, Grelottons, Reptiles, et la ruine des Biens, Vie, et Honneur de Celi[illegible]. 1[illegible]. (Illegible printer's name).

Les Amours d'Anne d'Autriche. Cologne, 1663. (No ed.)

Les Amours du Palais Royal. Paris, 1[illegible].

Mémoires Secrets de la Cour Persane. 1[illegible] Amsterdam, 1[illegible].

Secret History of Europe. London, 1734.

VOYAGES IMAGINAIRES

L'Officieux Homme. Le Voyage Souterrain. (In Voyages Imaginaires, 1787, Vol. [illegible].

Antonius Diogenes. Of the Wonders beyond Thule. Cir. 1st Century. (preserved only in summary by Photius, ed. Bekker, pp. 149-153.)

d'Autignac Abbé (Géjélin). La Relation du Royaume de Coromandel. 1654. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. [illegible]).

Aubin Penelope. Adventures of Count de Vinevil. London, 1721.

Aubin Penelope. Life of Madame de Beaumont. London, 1721.

Aubin Penelope. The Noble Slaves. London, 1722.

Aubin Penelope. Life and Adventures of the Lady Lucy. London, 1726.

Bacon Francis. De Atlantis. 1624. London, 1638 (Morley, Ideal Commonwealths).

Barnes Joshua. Gerania. Cambridge, 1675.

Bergerac Cyrano de. Voyage dans la Lune. 1650. Les Vers, 1859, ed. by Reveil.

Bergerac Cyrano de. Histoire Comique des États et Empires du Soleil. 1662. Paris, 1886, ed. by Lemaitre.

Berquin Arnaud. Le Voyage de Sidias de Berseuil. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. [illegible]).

Berington Simon. Gesualdo de Lucco. 1737. Dublin, 1[illegible].

Bibliander. Utopia. 1[illegible].

Bissel J. Icaria. London, 1[illegible].

Bonnaval Comte. Le Voyage de Levant. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. XIII).

Brunt L. Voyage to Constantinople. London, 1737.

Campanella T. Civitat Solis. 20 .

Castelnau Henriette Julie de. Le Voyage de Campagne. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. XIII).

Chetwood W. R. Adventures of Captain Robert Boyle. London, 1726.

Clairfons Gallien P. de. Les Iles Fortunées. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. I).

Daniel Père. Voyage to Peril of Cartesius. 12 . London, 1693.

Defoe Daniel. Robinson Crusoe. London, 1719.

Defoe Daniel. Voyages of Richard Falconer. London, 1720.

Defoe Daniel. Captain Singleton. London, 1720.

Defoe Daniel. New Voyage round the World. London, 1725.

Fontaines Perr. F. de. Le Nouveau Gulliver. 1727. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. V).

Harington Edward. The Oceana Uarvit. 1727. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol.).

Ibn-Tophail. Hai Ben Yeckdan. cir. 1320. London, 1708, tr. by Ockley, 1 vo.

Foigni Gabriel de. Les Aventures de Jacques Sadeur. 1676. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. XIVI).

Montbrun Jean de la. Le Voyage de Merin, en Armenie. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. XVIII).

Godin Jean. Le Nouveau Monde. 1666. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. II).

Godwin Francis. Voyage of Domingo Gonzales to the World of the Moon. pub. 1638. (reprinted in Harris, Vol. , pp. -).

Grivel Guillaume. L'Isle Inconnue. 1724? (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol.VII, VIII, IX).

Hall J. Mundus Alter et Idem. London, 1607. London, 1609.

Harrington J. Commonwealth of Oceana. London, 1657.

Hartlib Samuel. Description of Macaria. 1641. (In Harleian Miscellany, Vol. IV, pp. -).

Legrand Jerk Antoine. Les Aventures du Voyageur Heritz. (In Voyages I-

...ginaires, Vol. ...).

...ucois Auteuil. ...e Voyage en Italie. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. ...).

...Huillier Charles ...). ...e Voyage de Chapelle et de Bachaumont. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. ...Vii).

...ettin ...ourte ...artin. ...e Retour de Saint-Cloud à Paris. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. ...).

X ...ucian. The True History. cir. 200. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. ...II, tr. by [illegible] d'Ablancourt, Cyrano [illegible], with allegorical continuations).

X ...ontpensier ...uchesse de, ...nne M... Louise d'Orléans. La Relation de l'Isle Imaginaire. 1662. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. ...).

X ...ore Sir Thomas. Utopia. 1516. London, 1904, reprint of Tr. (1551) by Robinson, L. ...ouly Charles Fleury de. Nouvelle. 1722. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. ...; ...II).

X ...Real ...uis Geiteau...r. ...e Voyage de Paris à Saint-Cloud sur mer et le retour sur terre. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. ...).

X ...ercenais ...guret. The Blazing World. London, 1666.

Vinto ...ernandez ...ndes. Les Aventures d'une Corsaire Portugaise. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. ..., tr. from Correspondencia de Inda (1614-) Wren Alexis. ...e Voyage de Cosmo. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. ...Viii).

X ...evedo ...rancisco ...ez. Visiones. 1627-1627. London, 1641.

...ister John. Visits. London, 1660.

...cimbel ...udwig. Reisenburg. Stuttgart (?), 1731.

X ...ift ...o'Nothing. Gulliver's Travels. London, 1726.

X ...elisent l'Isle D... ...e Voyage de l'Isle d'Amour. 1663. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. ...VI).

X ...eiraisse ...nis. Histoire des Severambes. 1677. (Eng. tr. or original of 1675-1679). London, 1738.

...illiam Simon. Discovery of a World in the Moon. 1638. London, 1638.

...dventures of ...ames ...ucordier and His Wife. London, 1713.

Les Aventures d'un Jeune Anglois. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. ...).

Comus, ou l'Heureux prodigieux transporté dans l'air, sur la terre, et [illegible] Amsterdam, 1711.

Visit to the Court of Apollo. London, 1689.

Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans la nouvelle découverte [illegible] Paris, 1[illegible].

Relation d'un Voyage du Pole Arctique au Pole Antarctique par le centre du monde. 1723. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. XIX).

Relation du naufrage d'un Vaisseau Allemand. (In Voyages Imaginaires, Vol. [illegible]).

Travels of Sir John Mandeville. 1[illegible].

Travels through Terra Australis Incognita [illegible] London, 1[illegible]).

Ver Vol[illegible]tate tract-- Ophir. 1[illegible].

Conte de Fee

Arreno Christoforo. Travels and Adventures of Three Princes of Serendip. 1557. London, 17[illegible].

Aunoeuil [illegible]. La Comtesse, Voisin de Gassigny. Le Comte Tonnelier. Paris, 1711.

Avenon [illegible]. Zadoiski, fils de Tenif. 1713. London, 17[illegible].

Cagius, Nouveaux Contes Orientaux. 1710. (In Cabinet des Fees, 1737, Vol. [illegible]).

Crebillon, Prosper, le Fils. Le Sylphe. Paris, 1713.

Crebillon Prosper, le Fils. Tanzai et Neadarne. 1734. London, 1742.

Dueullette T. S. Les Soirées Bretonnes. 1712. (In Cabinet des Fées, Vol. [illegible]).

Dueullette T. S. Tartarian Tales. 1715. London, 1761, tr. by C. Ifloyd.

Dueullette, T. S. Chinese Tales. 1715. London, 1834, tr. by Smithers, [illegible].

Dueullette T. S. Mogul Tales. 1711. London, 1736, tr. by [illegible]. Reilly.

Dueullette T. S. Peruvian Tales. 1734. London, 1736 (In Novelists' Magazine, Vol. XXI, tr. by J. Ramsay).

Fontaine [illegible]. Les Amours de Psiché et de Cupidon. 1669. London, 174[illegible], tr. by Ozell, J.

Héritier [illegible]. Les contes [illegible]. Paris, 17[illegible].

[illegible]. Trois nouveaux contes des fées. [illegible], vol. [illegible]).

Lemerie [illegible]. Le. Contes indiens. [illegible] vol. [illegible]).

[illegible] Arabian Nights. Tr. by Galland, 1704. [illegible] vol. III-[illegible]).

[illegible] Pilpay's Fables. Tr. [illegible] by Keith-Falconer, London, 1885. Other forms referred to in the text are Livre des lumières ou la conduite des rois, par Nevid Sahio d'Ispahan, Paris, 1644; Morall Philosophy of Doni, tr. from Italian by T. North, 1570 (reprint, London, 1888, ed. by Jacobs,).

[illegible] Persian Tales. Tr. by Petis de la Croix, Petis de la, 1710. [illegible] vol. IV).

[illegible] Turkish Tales. Tr. by Petis de la Croix, Petis de la, 1707 (1675?) [illegible] vol. VI).

Collections of Novelle.

The separate [illegible] from novella in the restricted sense has been found impossible, as a result of the practice of later novellieri, that here are included all collections of short, historical tales, romans, novelas, etc. The classification of some of the 16th century novelle from the works of writers is anything but sharp.

[illegible] Cento novelle antiche. Bologna, 1525. [illegible] of this translation (1572) in [illegible] Novelle.-- Historia of Lucidano and other rare [illegible].

[illegible] d'Aulnoy Marie [illegible]. Nouvelles espagnoles. Paris, [illegible].

[illegible] Bandello Matteo. Novelle. 1554. Lucca, 1812, ed. by Gioachino [illegible].

[illegible] Belleau Remy. Diverses Historiques. Paris, 1561.

[illegible] Behn, Aphra. The little black lady. 1698. London, 1871 (Plays, histories, and novels of the Duke of Buckingham, etc. Aphra Behn, Vol. V).

[illegible] Behn Aphra. The king of Lantam. 1687. London, 1871 (Plays, histories and novels of Mrs. Behn).

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] of [illegible] and [illegible] Elizabeth.

Vol. II

[illegible] rincess of Clevez.

[illegible] arcous [illegible]ess.

The [illegible]evive[illegible] [illegible]itive.

Select collection of novels and Histories in six volumes. London, 1729. (This is a reprint of [illegible]. Crosslil's six volumes with the same title, in 1722. But the contents differ somewhat from those detailed by Miss Morgan, pp. [illegible].

In Vol. I is [illegible] the History of the [illegible] Duke Grey.

[illegible] dventures on [illegible]ious Mountains.

In Vol. II [illegible]Theron.

In Vol. III [illegible] Thore.

In Vol. IV Henry II and [illegible]ir [illegible]ons.

In Vol. V [illegible]ell of Desert of Sfex. (Love [illegible]tales and All [illegible]) above

In Vol. VI History of Massimiello.

[illegible]ary, Queen of Scots.

Moreover, the contents of Vol. V and VI are curiously interchanged in certain cases, and consequently [illegible]iss Morgan, Vol. VI) is omitted in 1729.

[illegible] Strange and [illegible]onstrous Servant, [illegible]. 1684. (In [illegible] Miscellany, Vol. III, pp. [illegible]7-[illegible]3.

[illegible]arleton's Mere out of Purgatorie. [illegible]. London, 1684. (Harleian Miscellany [ul., Vol. V).

Virgilius. (In Thoms, Early English Prose Romances, Vol. I).
London, 1828

[illegible]estoura for Knights. [illegible]? (In Percy Society [illegible]., Vol. [illegible]).

(This portion of the bibliography is given in order that the thesis may appear complete. The arrangement of titles is temporary and uncertain; and a very large number of titles of collections of letters, memoirs, etc., which have been planned more sufficiently to cover the author but they contain nothing of moment, have been omitted. The list of titles is, then, divided for the present into

(a) Works treating wholly or largely upon fiction, and of a date before 1750.

(b) Works commenting upon fiction, one of a date later than 1750.

(c) Periodicals before 1750.

As I have said in the preface, the treatment of fictional theory in any modern treatise upon pre-18th century fiction is almost impossible. But I have wished to indicate exactly the limits of my researches.)

Books on the Theory of Fiction, and Works before 1750

Abbadie, L. Louis. De la grande Eloquence. Amsterdam, Roger, 1687.

Académie. Les Jeux de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne. Paris, Lacroix, 1857, ed. by E. de Crisenoy. [Also Boileau's Satires, II, III, IX; Art Poétique, III; Lutrin, V; Letter to Brossette, Jan. 7, 1707]

Boileau. Réflexions sur Longin.

Boccalini T. De' Ragguagli di Parnaso. 1612. London, 1669, tr. by Henry, Earl of Monmouth.

Burton R. Anatomy of Melancholy. London, 1621.

Charnes Abbé de. Conversations sur la critique de la Princesse de Clèves. Paris, 1679.

[Any Author]. Private Memoirs. London, 1696.

Dekker, Thomas. Works. In Cath Literary, ed. by Grosart,

Francion. Le Premier des Romans. Paris, 1622.

Huet P. D. Traité de l'origine des Romans. 1671. London, 1711, tr. by Lewis, P.

...ptiana. Paris, 1721.

...ueret Marie. ...e Jerusalem reformé. Paris, 1661.

...ueret Marial. ...e Pre-cende de Saint-Leon. [1711], ...

...pson Ben. Timor. Lond. [illegible] London, 17..., ... Hamilton, ...

...nglet-Dufresnoy Luc, Jardin de Vrest. ...Jardin des Savans. Paris, 17...

...ndon, 1873

...oige Thomas. A reply to ...mas Jesson's Letter of ...ust. ...ul. [illegible]

...oras-- Waterton Club ..., Vol. ...

...olière. Les précieuses ridicules. 1...

...owne Dorothy. Letters to Sir William ...gil. 16...-16... Camden, 18...

...udery Mademoiselle de. Conversations sur divers sujets. Paris, 1680. Conver-

...sations Nouvelles, 1680. Conversations Nouvelles, 1...

...sur divers sujets ils en ... la manière d'inventer sans ...lie, reprinted verbat-

im from Clélie, Tome VIII, pp. 1118-1148.

...évigné ...me. de. Lettres ... ...me. de Sévigné.

...mith ... Gregory. Miscellaneous critical Essays. Oxford, 1...

...ourse of the reprinted ...terials.

...oulze Jean ...ac. Le Dictionnaire des Précieuses. 1...

...ivet, C. ...

...orel Charles. La Bibliothèque Française. Paris, Nouvelle [illegible], 16...

...orel Charles. De la Connoissance des Beaux Livres. Paris, 16...

...plegarn ... ... Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century. Oxford, 1...

...villeneuve. Lettres sur la Princesse de Clèves. Paris, 1...

...vega Lope de. Curso de Romaticos. (In Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, Tomo 38).

...illiers George. The Rehearsal. 1...7 London, 167...

...illoch ... ... to Ja... London, 1...

...ollivarius. London, 1...

...oodcock Charles[illegible]. Letter of [illegible] Lady ...ckelay's Old Maids, Vol. ...ii).

Baker . . History in mystic fiction. [illegible], [illegible], 19[illegible].

Beers H. A. English romanticism in the 18th Century. New York, 1890.

Bonfigli . . Le novelliste italiane. Città di Nuovaia Penne, 1911, [illegible] 2nd ed. 1[illegible].

Bret . . De l'Arcadie de Sidney et de son influence sur les mœurs et la littérature du XVIème siècle et du XVIIème siècle. Paris, 1885.

Braunfels. Kritische Versuch über den Roman Lodwig von Hallien. Leipzig, 1879.

Brubacher . . Sir Philip Sidney's Arcadia und ihre Verbesserer. Nürnberg, 1913.

Brydges . . British bibliographer. London, 1810.

Casey J. Short story in English. New York, 1909.

Chandler F. W. Romances of Roguery. London, 1899.

Chandler F. W. The Literature of Roguery. New York., 1907.

Chartrand . . L'influence française en Angleterre au XII siècle. Paris, 1906.

Cholevius Leo. Die Novelle[illegible] deutsche Poesie des 17ten Jahrhunderts. Halle, 1866.

Claretie . . Lessing sur le page, le valet. Paris, 1[illegible].

Collier . . Bibliographical and Critical Account of the rarest books in the English language. London, 1865.

Conant Martha. The Oriental Tale in England in the 18th Century. New York. 1908.

Cross . . . The development of the English Novel. London, 1899.

Dussil . . La Société française au 17ème Siècle. Paris, 1875.

Elster . . Englische Kommunist. Berlin, 191[illegible].

Frank Nathan. The Drummer. London, 1911.

Gosse E. W. History of Prose Fiction. 1914. London, 1[illegible].

Gourmont R. La littérature indépendante et les écrivains oubliés au XVème Siècle. Paris, 1[illegible].

Fürst Rudolph. Die Verleumder der deutschen Novelle im 16ten Jahrhundert. Halle, 1887.

Hamling . . Märten und von und Sonne. Leipzig, 1887.

Hart . . . . Satire and Epic. Boston, 1907.

Horne Charles F. The Technique of the Novel. New York, 1908.

Hume Martin. Spanish Influence on English Literature. London, 1905.

Jusserand J. History of Early Italian Literature to the Death of Dante.

Kossé A. Hume's Letters. (In Fortnightly Review, Vol. [illegible], p.s., pp. 500 sqq.)

Green J. Mrs. Common Readers and Romance Writers. London, 1910.

Griffin Richard. Novelists and Romancers. New York, 1911.

Laquis d'Isse. Entretiens sur les Romans. Paris, 1755.

Guilleville Petit de. Histoire de la langue et la litterature française. Paris, 1896.

Hazelrand W. J. English Novel in the Time of Shakespeare. London, 1916.

Herpel . . Studien zur Geschichte der italienischen Novelle in der englischen Litteratur des XVIten Jahrhundert.

Hoerting J. J. Geschichte des französischen Romans im 17ten Jahrhundert. Oppeln und Leipzig, 1891.

Krumbacher. Geschichte der byzantischen Litterautur. Munich, 1891.

Le Breton A. Le Roman au 17ème Siecle. Paris, 1890.

Le Breton A. Le Roman au 18ème Siecle. Paris, 1898.

Lennox Charlotte. Shakespeare Illustrated. London, 1753.

Lenient C. de. Sur les Romans. (In Revue des Deux Mondes, Dec. 1, 1857; July 15, 1858; Feb. 1, 1860; Mar. 1, 1871).

Mornet Eugene. Le Roman Courtois au 17ème Siecle. Paris, 1910. (In Revue Universitaire, Year XIX, p. 401-21).

Martino Pierre. L'Orient dans la Litterature Française au XVIème et XVIIème Siecle. Paris, 1906.

Mecius Hans. Gothic Romance. Leipzig, 1875.

Morgan Charlotte. Novel of Manners. New York, 1911.

Morillot A. Le Roman en France depuis 1610 jusqu'a nos jours. Paris, 1890.

Nicolai A. Über Entstehung und Wesen des Griechischen Romans. Berlin, 1857.

Paris G. La Litterature Française au Moyen Age. Paris,

Perry Bliss/ A Study of Prose Fiction. Boston, 1902.

[illegible] . . . . eginnings of the [illegible] novel. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] . The [illegible] novel. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] of [illegible]. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] [illegible]. Le roman sentimental avant l'[illegible]. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] [illegible]. Der griechische [illegible]. [illegible], [illegible]. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] et les [illegible] de Charles [illegible]. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] . . . . Comparison, criticism, and estimate of [illegible] novelists from 1700-1850. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] . History of criticism. [illegible] of [illegible], [illegible]-[illegible].

[illegible] [illegible]. Die Entwicklung des [illegible]romans.

[illegible] . Zum "[illegible]" über den griechischen Roman. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] . Einfluss des französischen Idealismus und des [illegible]ismus von Saltzen auf die deutsche Kultur. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] . . Introduction to the study of English fiction. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] . . Literary criticism in the [illegible]. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] [illegible]. Memoirs of the life and writings of the [illegible] of France. [illegible], 1780.

[illegible] . History of [illegible] literature. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] [illegible]. Literature of French [illegible]. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] [illegible]. History of English rose fiction. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] on the [illegible]. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] . . [illegible]ish literature in the [illegible] of the [illegible]. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] . . French influence in [illegible] literature from the [illegible] of [illegible] to the Restoration. [illegible], 1908.

[illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] in [illegible]. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] . . History of the novel previous to the 17th Century. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] . . [illegible] early [illegible] novelists. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] . [illegible] in [illegible] fiction. [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] universel des romans. [illegible], 1787 seq.

[illegible] des [illegible]. [illegible], 1787 seq.

Memoirs of the Life of P. D. Huet. London, 1810.

La Nouvelle Francaise au XVeme Siecle. Paris, 1910.

Periodical Publications before 1740.

Addison, Steele, et al. The Spectator. 1711-1713.

Steele, Addison, et al. The Tatler. 1709-1711.

Brown Tom. Amusements Serious and Comical Calculated for the Meridian of London. 1700. London, 1730 (Works, Vol. III).

Desfontaines Pierre F. Nouvelliste du Parnasse. (Ms. at Bibliotheque Nationale).

Desfontaines Pierre F. Reflexions sur les ouvrages nouveaux. (Ms.)

Desfontaines Pierre F. Observations sur les écrits modernes. (Ms.)

Motteux P. A. Gentleman'S Journal. 1692-1694.

Steele Richard. The Guardian. 1714. (In British Essayists, 1727, Vol. XII and XIII).

Ward Ned. London Spy. London, 1703. (Works-- Vol. I and II).

High German Doctor. 1714. London, 1720.

Memoirs of the Society of Grub Street. 1730. London, 1737.

The Craftsman. 1726seq.

The Post-boy. 1706?

Terrae Filius. 1721. London, 1726.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 082197630